

### Marek Kwiek

- 1) Center for Public Policy Studies, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan, Poland
- 2) German Center for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW), Berlin, Germany  
[kwiekm@amu.edu.pl](mailto:kwiekm@amu.edu.pl), ORCID: [orcid.org/0000-0001-7953-1063](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7953-1063)

### Wojciech Roszka

- 1) Poznan University of Economics and Business, Poznan, Poland
- 2) Center for Public Policy Studies, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan, Poland  
[wojciech.roszka@ue.poznan.pl](mailto:wojciech.roszka@ue.poznan.pl), ORCID: [orcid.org/0000-0003-4383-3259](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4383-3259)

## Top Research Performance Over Time: A Multidimensional Micro-Data Approach

### Abstract

In this research, the contribution of a highly productive minority of scientists to the national Polish research output over the past three decades (1992–2021) is explored. Four classes of top performers (the upper 1%, 3%, 5%, and 10%) are examined using four productivity measurements. A temporal stability of productivity patterns is found: the upper 1% of scientists, on average, account for 10% of the national output, and the upper 10% account for almost 50% of total output, with significant disciplinary variations. The 1/10 and the 10/50 rules consistently apply across the three decades studied. The Relative Presence Index (RPI) we constructed shows that men are over-represented in all top performers classes. Top performers are studied longitudinally through their detailed publishing histories, with micro-data coming from the raw Scopus dataset. Econometric models identify the three most important predictors changing the odds ratio estimates of membership in top performance classes: gender, academic age, and publishing patterns. The downward trend in fixed effects over successive six-year periods indicates increasing competition in academia. A large population of internationally visible Polish scientists (N=152,043) with their 587,558 articles is studied. Implications for high productivity studies are shown, and limitations are discussed.

**Keywords:** research top performers; longitudinal study design; journal prestige normalization; productivity; logit generalized linear models; fixed effects

### 1. Introduction

The total national research output is produced by scientists from different disciplines and institutions, by men and women of different academic seniority, biological age, research experience, and different collaboration and publishing patterns. However, most importantly for this research, the national research output is produced by scientists with highly skewed individual publishing productivity (David 1994): In the course of their careers, a small minority of scientists author large numbers of publications, and most scientists publish little (Crane 1965; Allison 1980; Xie 2014; Ruiz-Castillo and Costas 2014), with individual performance following a Paretian (power law) rather than Gaussian (normal) distribution (O’Boyle and Aguinis 2012). The science profession is vertically stratified, and the skewness of science has been widely discussed in the past half a century, mostly in bibliometric and economics of science literature (e.g., Cole and Cole 1973; Seglen 1992; Stephan 2012).

In the present paper, we explore the contribution of the highly productive minority of scientists (termed the top performers class) to the national Polish research output over the past 30 years (1992–

2021). The contribution of top performers will be studied longitudinally at the micro-level of individual scientists: All scientists are tracked over time from their first publication in the 1992–2021 period to the latest one. Details of their individual administrative histories (from the national registry of scientists) and their publishing histories (from the Scopus database) are unpacked and subsequently aggregated to higher levels of disciplines, institutional types, academic experience groups, and periods of time—at which top performers are contrasted with the rest of the Polish scientific workforce.

Top performers have always produced the bulk of publications in all national science systems (Rosen 1981; Ioannidis et al. 2014; Xie 2014). However, it is interesting to analyze their role in a single, hugely expanding science system (Poland) from both temporal and cross-disciplinary perspectives. In other words, our interest is whether, during the 30 years studied, the role of top performers in academic knowledge production has remained unchanged amid intensive socio-economic changes accompanied by radical transformations of higher education and science systems.

Our approach is quantitative, and in the current publication- and citation-based research, we study 152,043 Polish scientists from 15 STEM disciplines (science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and medicine) and their 587,558 research articles published in five 6-year periods (1992–2021) in globally indexed Scopus journals. Our focus is on scientists and their properties, rather than publications and their attributes. However, our classes of top performers are defined using publication and citation metadata so that individual publishing productivity is normalized to the period, discipline, and journal prestige (in two out of four of the publishing productivity measurements applied).

## **1.1. The Focus on Top Research Performance**

Research top performance is attracting the attention of academic communities; it is also attracting the attention of science policy communities, at all levels from departments to institutions to national systems to the global science system (Aguinis and O’Boyle 2014). Exceptionally high producers of scholarly publications are “strategic” in studying academic science (Fox and Nikivincze 2021). The whole traditional architecture of the academic enterprise, as presented in the traditional sociology of science and sociology of academic careers (Hermanowicz 2012), is based on products and their impact on the science community (publications and their citations) and on productivity (publications within a unit of time). Both recognition in science and academic progression, promotion, tenure, research funding, and access to national and global collaboration networks are publication driven (Stephan 2012). There are two main classes of drivers behind publishing productivity: individual drivers and environmental drivers (which include both “work climate” in departments and institutions and national science systems that have different recognition and promotion systems) (see Fox and Mohapatra 2007; Leisyte and Dee 2012; Tang and Horta 2023).

As the most highly productive scientists operating within their departmental, institutional, disciplinary, national, and international communities, research top performers have been examined through two methodological approaches: qualitative and quantitative. The qualitative approach includes interviewing scholars and scientists listed as top performers to see why they are so productive (e.g., Kiewra and Creswell 2000; Mayrath 2008), and the quantitative approach includes numerous survey and publication data-driven (e.g., bibliometric) studies.

The research on top performers and their role in national science systems has been studied in the past few decades under different labels. The steep productivity stratification of scientists has been examined in basic publications for both academic career studies and bibliometrics. Top performers

have been termed star scientists (Abramo et al. 2009; Carrasco and Ruiz-Castillo 2014); stars, superstars, and star performers (Rosen 1981; Serenko et al. 2011; Aguinis and O'Boyle 2014; Agrawal et al. 2017; Sidiropoulos 2016); the best (O'Boyle and Aguinis 2012); the prolific (Fox and Nikivincze 2021) and prolific professors (Piro et al. 2016); top producing authors (Halevi et al. 2015) and hyperprolific authors (Ioannidis et al. 2018); as well as top researchers (Cortés et al. 2016), top performers (Abramo et al. 2011), and academic and scientific elites (Larivière et al. 2010; Parker et al. 2010). The classes of scientists examined in the high productivity literature have had a single attribute in common: They were all at the right end of the publishing productivity distribution within universities, disciplines, and countries and, in some cases, also cross-nationally (Agrawal et al. 2017; Rosen 1981).

The various individual characteristics of top performers and the characteristics of their institutions and academic climates within their departments (e.g., Turner and Mairesse 2005; Fox and Mohapatra 2007) have been studied. The modest impact of their high productivity on the productivity of their departments has been explored (Piro et al. 2016). Patterns of their academic collaboration (Abramo et al. 2011) and international mobility (Halevi et al. 2015) have been examined. Top performers have been found to be over-represented among the top earners across 10 European systems: Highly productive academics tend to receive higher salaries compared with their lower-performing colleagues at the same academic seniority levels (Kwiek 2018).

Finally, high research productivity at the individual level has been found to be persistent over time (Turner and Mairesse 2005; Kelchtermans and Veugelers 2013). The vast majority of top performers in French physics (66%) remained top performers within the 12 years studied (Turner and Mairesse 2005), and about one-third of top performers in Italy (35%) remained top performers in the 10 years studied (Abramo et al. 2017). Radical bottom-to-top (Jumpers-Up) and top-to-bottom (Droppers-Down) mobility between publishing productivity classes from a lifetime perspective was shown to be a very rare scholarly phenomenon when studied on a sample of 324,463 scientists with 25–50 years of publishing experience from 38 OECD countries (Kwiek and Szymula 2024).

In a recent study of 2,326 Polish full professors tracked over time for up to 40 years (Kwiek and Roszka 2024), previous top performance (e.g., being highly productive at earlier stages of academic careers) was shown to be a strong predictor increasing the odds of later top performance. Based on a national survey of the academic profession (N=2,593) from the early 2010s, the upper 10% of Polish scientists across all academic disciplines have been reported to be responsible for about 50% of the total national research output (Kwiek 2018). Another survey-based study has shown that the upper 10% of scientists in terms of publishing productivity are responsible for about half of all research production not only in Poland but across 11 European systems (Kwiek 2016): what has been termed the 10/50 rule.

However, in almost all previous research (exceptions where 10-12 years were examined include Turner and Mairesse 2005; Kelchtermans and Veugelers 2013; and Abramo et al. 2017), the approaches are missing the time component. Cross-sectional studies, both national and international, were not complemented by longitudinal studies: Scientists comprising the classes of top performers (and the rest of the science profession) have not been tracked over time. We ask a simple research question: Are the patterns in the shares of national output that research top performers were producing in the past 30 years stable over time? Research top performers are discussed in four versions and defined as the top 1%, 3%, 5%, and 10% classes of scientists in terms of publishing productivity, each separately ranked within each STEM discipline.

## 1.2. The Focus of this Research

In the present research, we analyzed the role of research top performers by gender, academic age (or publishing experience), academic discipline, institutional type, and, most of all, changing over time over the period of 30 years (1992–2021). We used administrative data from our Laboratory of Polish Science and raw publishing and citation data from Scopus (made available to us through a multiyear agreement with the International Center for the Study of Research ICSR Lab).

To gain better insights into the changing productivity patterns over time, we have applied four versions of publishing productivity: two journal prestige-normalized and two non-normalized approaches (full counting and fractional). In the prestige-normalized approaches, we follow the fundamental concept of Polish research assessment exercises in the past 15 years: “Academic journals are not equal.” We study the productivity of individual scientists in relation to the productivity of other individual scientists, and we use classes of scientists (e.g., the top 10% vs. the rest) rather than publication numbers. As a result, we avoid issues related to increasing numbers of journals indexed in Scopus over time and increasing participation of Polish scientists in them over time.

Research output at the individual level (limited to research articles and papers in conference proceedings) was computed for five 6-year study periods, four top performers classes, 15 STEM disciplines, and four productivity measurements. We compared the output produced by top performers to the output produced by the rest of scientists (e.g., the output by the upper 10% vs. the remaining 90% of scientists, by the upper 1% vs. by the remaining 99%, etc., from the most inclusive to the most selective definition of top performers).

Our initial hypothesis was that the role of top performers should steadily increase over time. We hypothesized that there is increasing concentration of research activities (leading to increasing concentration of published research output) by top performers. However, our results show that the role of top performers as knowledge producers in statistical terms is surprisingly stable over the three decades studied. In most general terms, the upper 10% of scientists is responsible for almost 50% of publications, the upper 5% is responsible for about 30% of publications, the upper 3% is responsible for about 20% of publications, and the upper 1% is responsible for about 10% of publications. The role of top performers emerges from our research as fundamental today as it was 10, 20, and 30 years ago.

The instability of the national context for doing academic science in the past three decades is in sharp contrast with the stability of productivity patterns we have found in the very same, fundamentally volatile period for society and its universities. The past three decades in Poland have been a period of intensive social and economic transformations that have been accompanied by several waves of higher education, research funding, and research assessment reforms (Antonowicz et al. 2020; Donina et al. 2022). In this volatile environment, for 30 years, the contribution of top performers to the national research output was perfectly stable.

## 1.3. Research Questions and Hypotheses

The six research questions (Table 1) were based on selected findings in previous national and cross-national comparative studies on high research performance, both survey based (Parker et al. 2010; Fox and Nikivincze 2021) and bibliometrics based (Abramo et al. 2011; Ioannidis et al. 2014; Halevi et al. 2015). Our hypotheses refer to the temporal stability in the share of output produced by top performers over the past 30 years (H1), disciplinary (H2) and productivity measurement

differentiation (H3), unequal gender representation in top performance (H4); and, finally, major predictors of membership in top-productivity classes (H5), which is based on logit generalized linear models with fixed effects.

**Table 1.** Research questions, hypotheses, and summary of support.

Research Questions	Hypotheses	Support
<b>RQ1.</b> What is the relationship over time (1992–2021) between (1) total national research output and (2) the output produced by top performers?	<b>Temporal stability</b> <b>H1:</b> The relationship between (1) and (2) is relatively stable for all classes of top performers in the period studied.	Supported
<b>RQ2.</b> What is the disciplinary differentiation in the relationship between (1) and (2)?	<b>Disciplinary differentiation</b> <b>H2:</b> The relationship between (1) and (2) substantially differs by discipline for all classes of top performers.	Supported
<b>RQ3.</b> What is the differentiation in the relationship between (1) and (2) in terms of productivity measurements?	<b>Productivity type differentiation</b> <b>H3:</b> The relationship between (1) and (2) is not sensitive to productivity measurements.	Supported
<b>RQ4.</b> What is the relative presence of male and female scientists among top performers?	<b>Unequal gender representation in the top performance</b> <b>H4:</b> Men scientists are over-represented, and women scientists are under-represented among top performers of all classes in the vast majority of STEMM disciplines.	Supported
<b>RQ5.</b> What are the predictors of membership in the classes of top performers?	<b>Model approach to top-productivity classes: logit generalized linear models with fixed effects</b> <b>H5:</b> Gender, academic age, and research-intensive institutional affiliation are the most important predictors of membership in the four top performers' classes.	Partly supported

## 2. Data, Sample, and Methodological Approach

### 2.1. Data

We utilized two tables from the Scopus dataset: author data and bibliometric data. The first table, containing information about the authors, primarily included their full names, the disciplines in which they most frequently published their articles and papers in conference proceedings, and their unique Scopus ID. Information about their affiliations was also added to the author's table. The second table contained complete bibliometric data of the authors listed in the first table, along with their Scopus ID. Gender information (binary, estimated using a gender-identification software *genderize.io*) was added to the authors' database, and the dominant disciplines – based on all cited-references from publications from a period – was assigned to each scientist in a period. In addition, using the database from Elsevier's ICSR Lab, the year of each scientist's first publication was obtained.

In the authors' dataset, we had 6,885 cases (Polish and international authors), for which gender could not be defined, 14,431 cases with an unknown year of the first publication, and 49,939 cases for which the dominant discipline could not be determined. The database at this stage of data preparation contained 867,641 documents of any type published by 720,640 distinct authors (Polish authors and their international coauthors). In the next step of data preprocessing, only journal articles and papers in conference proceedings were selected. In the next step, it was decided to remove from

the analysis the non-STEMM disciplines and disciplines with small numbers of authors in our sample (DEC, HEALTH, IMMU, NURS, VET, BUS, ECON, HUM, PSYCH, SOC, DENT, and MULTI). The article dataset was then linked deterministically (using Scopus Author ID as the key) to the authors' database. Finally, the dataset contained administrative data on 152,043 Polish authors and bibliometric metadata on their 587,558 articles, allowing us to construct their lifetime publishing histories.

## 2.2. Sample

The total sample from which top performers were selected increases by period: from 23,166 scientists in 1992–1997 to 93,092 in 2016–2021 (Table 2). The upper 10% class in terms of productivity (for Productivity 1: prestige-normalized, full counting approach) increases accordingly: from 2,400 in the first period to 9,337 in the last period (Table 3). The distribution of top performers by top performers class, periods, gender, institutional type, and academic age group is shown in Supplementary Table 1.

About a quarter of all scientists in the five periods studied consistently come from research-intensive universities and about three-quarters from other universities (i.e., the Rest; we define research-intensive universities as those following a national excellence program for 2020–2026 in which 10 universities and technical universities were defined as research excellent, with additional research funding).

The percentage of top performers coming from research-intensive institutions remains almost unchanged over the analyzed period (and remains in the range of 25–32%; Supplementary Table 1). The percentage is unexpectedly low, is stable over time, and does not increase as we move up the high-performance class from the upper 10% to the upper 1%. Scientists from research-intensive universities are not over-represented, as could be expected: their shares in the subpopulation of top performers reflect their shares in the total population of scientists.

In general, the share of women among top performers of all four classes increases with each subsequent period (e.g., from about a quarter in the first to almost 40% in the last period in the case of the top 10%). The share of women among the top 1% almost doubles, reaching a quarter in the last period. However, for all periods, the share of women decreases with each subsequent top performance class: It is always the highest among the top 10% and the lowest among the top 1%.

In this research, our focus is on 15 STEMM disciplines: AGRI, agricultural and biological sciences; BIO, biochemistry, genetics, and molecular biology; CHEMENG, chemical engineering; CHEM, chemistry; COMP, computer science; EARTH, earth and planetary sciences; ENER, energy; ENG, engineering; ENVIR, environmental science; MATER, materials science; MATH, mathematics; MED, medical sciences; NEURO, neuroscience; PHARM, pharmacology, toxicology, and pharmaceuticals; and PHYS, physics and astronomy.

**Table 2.** The distribution of the total sample from which top performers were selected by six-year period, gender, institutional type, academic age (publishing experience) group, and STEMM discipline (frequencies)

Periods		1992–1997	1998–2003	2004–2009	2010–2015	2016–2021
<b>Total</b>		<b>23,166</b>	<b>36,366</b>	<b>54,346</b>	<b>76,310</b>	<b>93,092</b>
Gender	Female	8480	15,081	25,104	36,743	47,155
	Male	14,686	21,285	29,242	39,567	45,937
Research intensity	Research-intensive	6,338	9,889	14,216	20,306	25,232
	Rest	16,828	26,477	40,130	56,004	67,860
Academic age groups	0–9 years	14,529	24,170	35,278	47,396	54,040
	10–19 years	5,297	6,382	10,684	17,728	22,489
	20–29 years	2,853	4,350	5,132	6,098	10,256
	30 and more years	487	1,464	3,252	5,088	6,307
Discipline	AGRI	1,715	2,916	4,789	7,649	9,336
	BIO	2,524	3,766	5,199	7,280	8,922
	CHEM	3,318	4,818	6,159	7,731	8,221
	CHEMENG	220	375	491	535	570
	COMP	188	338	762	1,620	1,831
	EARTH	951	1,594	1,971	2,712	3,367
	ENER	50	109	223	559	1,036
	ENG	1,065	1,788	3,370	5,681	7,952
	ENVIR	421	767	1,456	2,636	3,928
	MATER	891	1,331	2,207	3,730	5,019
	MATH	898	1,248	1,705	2,204	2,244
	MED	6,900	12,224	20,143	26,929	33,167
	NEURO	230	366	455	652	892
	PHARM	375	410	420	509	535
PHYS	3,420	4,316	4,996	5,883	6,072	

**Table 3.** The distribution (for Productivity 1) of the subsample of top performers (the top 10%, 5%, 3%, and 1% scientists (in terms of productivity) by six-year period (% and frequencies).

	Top 10%	The top 5%	The top 3%	The top 1%
1992–1997	2,400	1,202	719	241
1998–2003	3,702	1,846	1,109	374
2004–2009	5,463	2,726	1,642	550
2010–2015	7,682	3,841	2,301	770
2016–2021	9,337	4,666	2,797	934

### 2.3. Methodological Approach

Our methodological approach is as follows:

- (1) *Longitudinal* (we track scientists over time within five 6-year periods of time, between 1992 and 2001).
- (2) *Relative* (we compare scientists using rankings of productivity percentiles, from the top to bottom percentiles rather than actual publication numbers).
- (3) *Classificatory* (we classify all scientists based on their productivity ranks and compare the four top performers classes with the rest of the scientists).
- (4) *Prestige-normalized* (we recognize the highly stratified nature of the current journal-based global science system, highlighting the average differences in scholarly effort and impact on the science community between publishing in generally low-impact journals and generally high-impact journals).

In our analyses, we use four productivity measurements—two journal prestige-normalized (based on Scopus CiteScore percentile ranks) and two non-normalized—in both full-counting and fractional counting versions: (1) Productivity 1 (prestige-normalized, full counting), (2) Productivity 2 (prestige-normalized, fractional counting), (3) Productivity 3 (non-normalized, full counting), and (4) Productivity 4 (non-normalized, fractional counting).

Our journal prestige-normalized approach to productivity (Productivity 1) is a leading approach, with the three others used to assess whether alternative measuring methods influence our results. The journal prestige-normalized approach is used to highlight the difference in average efforts and impact between articles published in generally unselective and low-prestige journals and in generally highly selective and high-prestige journals. The prestige normalization used is citation based and percentile ranks are determined annually in Scopus. As a result, articles in journals located higher in the Scopus CiteScore percentile ranks (N=42,403 journals, 2024) were given more weight in computing productivity than those articles in journals located lower (ranks range: 0–99). In a non-normalized approach to productivity, for the full-counting method, articles published in all journals received a value of 1, whereas in our prestige-normalized approach, for the full-counting method, articles in journals with a percentile rank of 90 received a value of 0.90; articles published in journals (and papers in conference proceedings) with percentile ranks of 10 and less received a value of 0.1.

For every scientist, we use a dominant academic discipline. Dominant disciplines are computed based on the modal value (or randomly selected value from among the dominants if there is more than one) from all disciplines (All Science Journal Classification used in Scopus, ASJC) assigned to the journals of all cited references in all papers in scientists' publications in a given six-year period. In other words, all cited references from all publications from a period are linked to ASJC disciplines, and their modal value for a period is selected. As a result, scientists can be assigned to the same or different STEM disciplines as their careers develop—which is a more fine-grained approach to discipline assignment than using all cited references from all publications (lifetime) to select a single dominant discipline for the whole career.

The gender of scientists (binary: male, female) was defined using *genderize.io*, a gender-determination software, with the probability threshold set at 0.85. Using the ICSR Lab database, we obtained the year of each scientist's first publication, allowing us to determine their academic age at any point in time. Institutional affiliation (binary: research-intensive, Rest) was defined as the dominating affiliation in a given six-year period based on publications' bylines from this period.

We divided the study period (1992–2021) into five 6-year periods. Separately within 15 STEM disciplines, we ranked all internationally visible scientists (i.e., scientists publishing research articles in Scopus-indexed journals) from the most productive to the least productive—according to the four approaches to productivity—and we created the four classes of research top performers (the upper 1%, 3%, 5%, and 10%) in each study period.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Empirical Patterns: Contribution of Top Performers to the Total National Research Output over 30 Years

Top performers produce a significant—and almost unchanging over time—proportion of Poland's total national research output in the five 6-year periods into which we have divided the last 30 years. In terms of Productivity 1 (prestige-normalized, full counting), for the top 10%, the proportion is in



the range of 43.8% to 46.6% for all disciplines combined (Figure 1, top panel), and for the top 1%, the proportion is in the range of 10.1% to 11.6% for all disciplines combined (Figure 2, top panel).

The structure of the Polish national output in terms of publications by the class of top performers versus the rest of the scientists remains surprisingly stable from a long-term perspective. The stability found may be related to the stability in the distribution of publishing productivity in the population of all scientists over time. In the simplest terms, when normalizing productivity to journal prestige (Productivity 1), the top 1% on average account for 10% of the national output, and the top 10% account for almost half of the national output. These proportions hardly change over time, meaning that the processes of increasing the concentration of publications in the hands of the most productive scientists are not observed.

However, significant disciplinary variations in each of the analyzed periods are observed. In each period, the highest proportion of national output for the top 10% was observed for PHARM (as much as 62.1% in the first period and 58.1% in the second period, Figure 1, bottom panel). For the largest discipline, MED, the proportion approached 50% for the last three periods. For the top 1% (Figure 2, bottom panel), the largest proportion was also observed for PHARM in the first, second, and last periods; and for MED, the proportion ranged from 10% to 13.0% over the entire study period.


At the same time, top performers do not form homogeneous classes. They are represented by men and women, they are affiliated with more research-intensive (Top) and less research-intensive (Rest) institutions, and they belong to different academic age groups (or groups of publishing experience, the time elapsed since their first publication) (Table 4). Using academic age as a proxy for biological age (Kwiek and Roszka 2022), we refer to them as beginners, early-career, midcareer, and late-career scientists (academic age groups 0–9, 10–19, 20–29, and 30 and more years of publishing experience, respectively).

**Table 4.** Publications by the top 10% (Productivity 1: prestige-normalized, full counting) as a percentage of all publications (the total national output), by gender, institutional type, and career age group, all STEM disciplines combined (in %)


Periods	Total	Gender		Research intensity		Career age groups			
		Female	Male	Res. intens.	Rest	Beginners (0–9 years)	Early-career scientists (10–19 years)	Midcareer scientists (20–29 years)	Late-career scientists (30 and more years)
1992–1997	43.8	34.7	47.6	41.7	44.7	26.3	50.5	62.0	68.0
1998–2003	45.4	36.0	50.1	45.8	45.2	25.3	55.5	61.6	66.9
2004–2009	46.6	37.3	52.3	47.4	46.3	24.1	56.2	62.6	69.6
2010–2015	46.4	37.8	52.4	47.7	45.9	22.6	54.4	65.0	67.8
2016–2021	45.5	38.4	51.0	46.0	45.2	23.0	52.5	61.6	61.7

Our analyses show substantial gender differences among the top 10% (Table 4). Although women in the top 10% are responsible for about one-third of all publications produced by women (so that the Rest of women are responsible for about two-thirds of all publications produced by women), with the share increasing over time, the concentration of research is substantially higher among the male top 10%. The male top 10% have been consistently responsible for more than 50% of all publications produced by men. The differences between the top 10% affiliated with research intensive versus with

all other institutions were marginal across the 30 years studied. For all periods among midcareer and late career scientists, the share of publications produced by top performers exceeds 60%.



**Figure 1.** Publications by the top 10% (Productivity 1: prestige-normalized, full counting) as a percentage of all publications (the total national output), by productivity measurement and period, all STEM disciplines combined (Top), and by STEM discipline and period (Bottom) (in %).



**Figure 2.** Publications by the top 1% (Productivity 1: prestige-normalized, full counting) as a percentage of all publications (the total national output), by productivity measurement and period, all STEM disciplines combined (Top), and by STEM discipline and period (Bottom) (in %).

The proportions of publications produced by the top 10%, 5%, 3%, and 1% in the total national output of various disciplines clearly shows a high concentration of publishing productivity that is stable over time. A small group of scientists has generated a significant proportion of work in their disciplines at similar levels across all analyzed periods (Figure 3). At the same time, these levels are close to each other, regardless of the approach to publishing productivity applied, as we can see from the details on concentration for the top 10% by the four productivity measurements (Supplementary Figure 1).

In some disciplines, the contribution of top performers is high across all periods—and in others, it is clearly lower. For example, PHARM clearly dominates in terms of concentration levels, which remain in the 52–62% range in the period studied. In contrast, MATH is characterized by a radically lower concentration of output (at the level of 36–42%), indicating a more even distribution of publications: mathematicians tend to contribute more equally to the total national output in mathematics. Small fluctuations can be observed for disciplines between successive periods, but these fluctuations do not translate into clear long-term trends.

## 3.2. Male and Female Top Performers

### 3.2.1. The Relative Presence Index (RPI) for Men and Women


The classes of the most productive scientists consist of male and female scientists, whose proportional contributions to the total national output may vary over time and differ between disciplines. In the seemingly homogeneous class of top performers, gender differences in proportional contributions to the total national output are observed.

In this section, we are interested in the *relative* presence of female top performers among top performers. We want to normalize the number of women among the top performers in a given period and discipline to the number of all women in the population of scientists in that period for that discipline. A higher proportion of men in a discipline in a period should be reflected by a higher proportion of men among the top performers in that discipline in that period (comparing apples with apples, see Nygaard et al. 2022). This relative approach to the presence of women among top performers allows us to show their role from a comparative perspective of disciplines—and from a comparative perspective of time—over the five 6-year periods.

Consequently, we have constructed what we term the Relative Presence Index (RPI). The RPI for women in the class of top performers equaling 1 means the same relative presence of men and women among top performers. The RPI for women can show the level of their over-representation (value above 1) or under-representation (value below 1) among top performers. Although the numbers (in a nominal approach) may confirm the simple fact that male top performers in a given discipline outnumber female top performers, the RPI for women provides a more adequate and intuitively understandable measure of their presence among top performers.

The RPI for men is constructed as the number of male top performers in relation to the total number of all men (in a given domain) divided by the number of female top performers in relation to the total number of all women (in a given domain).

$$\text{RPI} = (\text{n}(\text{TP\_men})/\text{n}(\text{all\_men})) / (\text{n}(\text{TP\_women})/\text{n}(\text{all\_women}))$$




**Figure 3.** Publications by top performers as a percentage of all publications (total national output), by top performers class, period, and STEMM discipline, Productivity 1: prestige-normalized, full counting (in %)

The RPI can vary over time, between disciplines, and according to the method of productivity calculation. Here, we analyze only the results for Productivity 1 (prestige-normalized, full-counting approach). In technical terms, the RPI is the quotient of two quotients: male top performers /all men divided by female top performers /all women (see Abramo et al. 2009 on “star scientists”). The relationship between the RPI for men and RPI for women is harmonic (rather than linear). If women in a domain show an RPI of 0.33, then men show an RPI of 3.03 ( $1/0.33$ ) in this domain; if women show an RPI of 0.5, then men show an RPI of 2 ( $1/0.5$ ).

How should the indexes of 1.29 for men and 0.77 for women for AGRI for the top 10% (in the period 1992–1997, Table 5) be interpreted? The indexes indicate that the representation of men in the top 10% is 29% higher than the representation of women in the top 10% in this discipline during this period. Thus, men are over-represented in the top 10% compared with women. Conversely, the representation of women in the top 10% is only 61% of the representation of men in the top 10% in this discipline during this period. Therefore, women are under-represented in the top 10% (at the same time, the relationship between the indexes is harmonic:  $1/1.29=0.77$ , with rounding).

The relative over-representation of men among the top 10% and top 1% (Table 5), as well as among the top 5% and top 3% (Supplementary Table 1), can be examined through several dimensions: by periods, or changing over time; by academic age groups, or changing by seniority; and by disciplines.




**Figure 4.** The Relative Presence Index (RPI) for men top performers, 1992–1997 vs. 2016–2021 (two periods only), all STEMM disciplines combined, by top performers class

**Table 5.** The Relative Presence Index (RPI) for men (left panels) and for women (right panels) top performers, the top 10% and top 1% (in terms of productivity) by six-year period, academic age group, and STEMM discipline (Productivity 1: prestige-normalized, full counting)

Variable	Category	1992–1997	1998–2003	2004–2009	2010–2015	2016–2021	1992–1997	1998–2003	2004–2009	2010–2015	2016–2021
		<b>Men</b>					<b>Women</b>				
		<i>The top 10%</i>									
<b>Academic age</b>	0–9 years	1.63	1.40	1.50	1.48	1.73	0.61	0.71	0.66	0.68	0.58
	10–19 years	1.29	1.31	1.31	1.25	1.19	0.77	0.76	0.76	0.80	0.84
	20–29 years	1.37	1.20	1.18	1.16	1.08	0.73	0.83	0.85	0.86	0.92
	30 & more years	1.03	1.28	1.16	1.15	1.06	0.97	0.78	0.86	0.87	0.94
<b>Discipline</b>	AGRI	1.29	1.42	1.56	1.46	1.52	0.77	0.70	0.64	0.69	0.66
	BIO	2.19	2.33	2.51	2.08	1.91	0.46	0.43	0.40	0.48	0.52
	CHEM	1.97	1.96	1.98	1.98	1.83	0.51	0.51	0.50	0.51	0.55
	CHEMENG	1.91	1.75	1.86	2.17	2.35	0.52	0.57	0.54	0.46	0.42
	COMP	1.55	0.63	0.88	0.94	2.00	0.65	1.59	1.14	1.06	0.50
	EARTH	2.05	1.86	1.96	1.89	1.35	0.49	0.54	0.51	0.53	0.74
	ENER	0.44	1.19	1.69	1.07	1.76	2.28	0.84	0.59	0.94	0.57
	ENG	3.03	1.95	1.86	1.97	1.74	0.33	0.51	0.54	0.51	0.58
	ENVIR	1.01	0.99	1.04	1.29	1.11	0.99	1.01	0.96	0.78	0.90
	MATER	1.37	1.51	1.53	1.41	1.43	0.73	0.66	0.65	0.71	0.70
	MATH	3.35	18.14	2.71	1.88	1.14	0.30	0.06	0.37	0.53	0.88
	MED	1.34	1.46	1.75	1.84	1.79	0.75	0.68	0.57	0.54	0.56
	NEURO	1.21	1.46	1.22	1.37	1.00	0.82	0.68	0.82	0.73	1.00
	PHARM	0.98	0.74	0.89	1.26	1.61	1.02	1.35	1.13	0.80	0.62
	PHYS	1.90	1.66	1.82	1.57	1.60	0.53	0.60	0.55	0.64	0.63
	<b>All dis. combined</b>	<b>1.56</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>1.71</b>	<b>1.66</b>	<b>1.59</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>0.62</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.60</b>	<b>0.63</b>
		<i>The top 1%</i>									
<b>Academic age</b>	0–9 years	2.94	2.82	3.54	2.54	3.75	0.34	0.35	0.28	0.39	0.27
	10–19 years	3.55	1.79	2.14	1.96	2.16	0.28	0.56	0.47	0.51	0.46
	20–29 years	3.16	2.26	1.57	1.66	1.80	0.32	0.44	0.64	0.60	0.55
	30 & more years	2.45	1.98	1.57	1.70	1.72	0.41	0.51	0.64	0.59	0.58
<b>Discipline</b>	AGRI	4.28	2.57	2.75	3.63	2.73	0.23	0.39	0.36	0.28	0.37
	BIO	4.63	6.32	8.76	5.42	3.84	0.22	0.16	0.11	0.18	0.26
	CHEM	9.01	3.60	2.74	2.64	2.61	0.11	0.28	0.36	0.38	0.38
	CHEMENG	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	COMP	-	-	1.27	0.79	3.71	-	-	0.79	1.26	0.27
	EARTH	-	3.32	2.17	1.96	2.09	-	0.30	0.46	0.51	0.48
	ENER	-	0.24	-	-	2.09	-	4.19	-	-	0.48
	ENG	-	-	5.90	5.04	2.59	-	-	0.17	0.20	0.39
	ENVIR	-	2.98	2.17	2.09	1.90	-	0.34	0.46	0.48	0.53
	MATER	0.51	3.11	2.46	1.95	2.72	1.95	0.32	0.41	0.51	0.37
	MATH	-	-	5.79	1.11	3.25	-	-	0.17	0.90	0.31
	MED	2.65	2.60	2.84	3.35	4.05	0.38	0.38	0.35	0.30	0.25
	NEURO	1.32	3.08	2.69	1.27	1.55	0.76	0.32	0.37	0.79	0.65
	PHARM	4.11	0.36	1.71	0.51	1.61	0.24	2.80	0.58	1.95	0.62
	PHYS	8.89	2.20	2.77	3.99	3.56	0.11	0.45	0.36	0.25	0.28
	<b>All dis. combined</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>2.85</b>	<b>2.97</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.34</b>

Note: - no representatives of a particular gender.



**Figure 5. Disciplinary differentiation.** The Relative Presence Index (RPI) for the male top 10%, 2016–2021 period only, Productivity 1: prestige-normalized, full counting, by STEMM discipline (in ascending order)

The general pattern shows that men are over-represented among each top performers class, and this over-representation increases when moving up the high-performance scale. In the last period studied (2016–2021), the RPI for the male top 10% was 1.59 and for the male 1% was 2.97 (all disciplines combined, Table 5). In terms of academic age groups, the index generally decreases, and for the top 10%, it approaches 1, though never reaching it. The RPI for men increases moving up the high-performance scale, with a very large over-representation of men found among the top 1%. In the five periods studied, for all top performers classes except the top 1%, the RPI remains at similar levels (Figure 4). Finally, in terms of discipline, the RPI is highly diversified (Figure 5). However, no simple relationship between the RPI and composition of the discipline by gender seems to apply. The RPI for women is inversely proportional to the RPI for men, and its interpretation is the inverse of the interpretation of the index for men.

## 4. Multidimensional Logistic Regression Approach

### 4.1. Logit Generalized Linear Models with Fixed Effects

To test the determinants of membership in the classes of the most productive scientists, we developed an econometric model. Because of the binary nature of the dependent variable, we used a logistic regression model with fixed effects (the independent variables are described in Table 7). The model built was a cross-sectional dynamic model (Fernández-Val and Weidner 2016; Hinz, Stammann, and Wanner 2020; Stammann 2018). The fixed effects in the model are periods and STEMM disciplines. The model is cross-sectional because the population is made up of individual scientists (the unit being a single scientist described by a vector of characteristics), and it is dynamic because there are five disjoint six-year periods. The inclusion of the time variable in the model as an independent variable would disturb the assumption of the independence of observations because individual scientists can publish in more than one period. At the same time, the periods differed in their social and economic characteristics (conditioning the functioning of the public science system). An additional advantage of periods treated as a fixed effect in the model was that publishing productivity could be compared between periods without the interference of external changes. The choice of disciplines as a second

fixed effect was directed by internal variations in publishing patterns within disciplines and the possibility of making cross-disciplinary comparisons without distortions associated with the influence of discipline-specific factors on overall productivity. R software version 4.3.0, RStudio version 2023.06.0 Build 421, and the “alpaca” package version 0.3.4 were used for the computations.

## 4.2. Independent Variables

The selection of variables (Table 7) was motivated by data availability and the relevant literature on high research performance. Because of the panel nature of the study, a logistic regression model with fixed effects was used. Four models were run for Productivity 1 and for the four classes of top performers (the top 10%, top 5%, top 3%, and top 1%; Table 8). In addition, 12 models were run for the other productivity measurements (Supplementary Table 3). To check the assumption of the lack of multicollinearity in the vector of independent variables, the inverse matrix correlation method was used between all four productivity measurements in terms of domains defined by discipline, academic age groups, gender, and institutional type. The analyses were conducted for each period and each class of top performers. Confidence intervals (95%) overlaps for logistic regression parameters estimates by independent variables and dependent variables are shown in Supplementary Table 5, model fit is discussed in Electronic Supplementary Material.

**Table 7.** Description of independent and fixed effects variables

Variable	Definition	Type of variable
Academic age	The difference between the year ending the period and the year of the author’s first publication	Quantitative continuous
Average team size	The arithmetic average of the size of the teams (the number of coauthors plus 1 for every article ) in a given period	Quantitative continuous
Collaboration rate	The percentage of articles written in collaboration: the ratio of the number of articles with one or more coauthors divided by the total number of articles in a given period (range 0–100%)	Quantitative continuous
International collaboration rate	The percentage of articles written in international collaboration: the ratio of the number of articles written in collaboration with an author with a foreign country affiliation divided by the total number of articles (range 0–100%)	Quantitative continuous
Gender	Author’s gender	Qualitative, binary (male, female)
Research intensity	Affiliation with one of the 10 institutions recognized as research-intensive institutions in the national IDUB research excellence program (2019–2026)	Qualitative, binary (Research-intensive, Rest)
Median journal percentile rank	The median percentile of the journals in the Scopus database (CiteScore percentile) in which the author’s articles were published in a given period	Quantitative continuous (1–99)
Discipline	Dominant discipline in the author’s all bibliographies (full lists of cited references), according to Scopus ASJC’s assigned journals	Qualitative, 15-variant
Period	Six-year publishing period, five periods in 1992–2021	Qualitative, 5-variant

## 4.3. Regression Results

In the regression models, we analyze which predictors change the probability of entering the classes of top performers. We study the class of the top 10% analyzed in terms of Productivity 1 first (Table 8; a



comparative analysis by productivity measurement for the top 10% class is presented in Supplementary Table 3).

**Table 8.** Logistic regression with fixed effects estimates (fixed effects: periods and disciplines), odds ratio estimates of membership in the class of the top 10%, top 5%, top 3%, and top 1% (in terms of productivity) (Productivity 1: prestige-normalized, full counting)

Top performers type	variable	Productivity 1 (prestige-normalized, full counting)			
		Exp(B)	LB	UB	Pr(>  z )
The top 10%	Academic age in period	1.074	1.073	1.076	0.000
	Average team size in period	1.005	1.003	1.007	0.000
	International collaboration rate in period	1.007	1.006	1.007	0.000
	Collaboration rate in period	1.004	1.003	1.005	0.000
	Gender: Male	1.418	1.378	1.459	0.000
	Institutional research intensity: Rest	0.992	0.963	1.023	0.613
	Median journal percentile rank in period	1.027	1.026	1.027	0.000
The top 5%	Academic age in period	1.075	1.074	1.077	0.000
	Average team size in period	1.007	1.004	1.009	0.000
	International collaboration rate in period	1.008	1.007	1.008	0.000
	Collaboration rate in period	1.006	1.004	1.007	0.000
	Gender: Male	1.624	1.561	1.689	0.000
	Institutional research intensity: Rest	1.011	0.971	1.053	0.587
	Median journal percentile rank in period	1.027	1.027	1.028	0.000
The top 3%	Academic age in period	1.076	1.074	1.078	0.000
	Average team size in period	1.005	1.002	1.009	0.002
	International collaboration rate in period	1.008	1.008	1.009	0.000
	Collaboration rate in period	1.007	1.005	1.008	0.000
	Gender: Male	1.854	1.762	1.952	0.000
	Institutional research intensity: Rest	0.999	0.949	1.051	0.955
	Median journal percentile rank in period	1.028	1.026	1.029	0.000
The top 1%	Academic age in period	1.081	1.078	1.084	0.000
	Average team size in period	1.007	1.001	1.012	0.014
	International collaboration rate in period	1.010	1.009	1.011	0.000
	Collaboration rate in period	1.009	1.006	1.012	0.000
	Gender: Male	2.277	2.077	2.497	0.000
	Institutional research intensity: Rest	0.944	0.867	1.027	0.181
	Median journal percentile rank in period	1.030	1.028	1.032	0.000

The model for the top 10% identifies three important predictors that increase the chances of success: gender, academic age, and publishing patterns. Men have significantly higher chances (41.8% on average) compared with women. The relatively narrow confidence interval (1.38–1.46) highlights the clear effect of gender on high publishing productivity. Each additional year of publishing increases the chance of success by an average of 7.4%. Again, the narrow confidence interval (1.073–1.076) further emphasizes the stable effect of academic age on high publishing productivity. The third important predictor is the median journal percentile rank, which captures the prestige of the journals in which scientists publish in a given period, which can be seen as a proxy of quality of their publications. An increase in this predictor by one unit (one additional percentile rank) results in an increase in the probability of success by an average of 2.7%.

Other important characteristics found in the model are the collaboration rate, the international collaboration rate, and the average team size. Each additional percentage point of the collaboration rate (in the 0–100 range) increases the probability of success by an average of 0.4%. The international collaboration rate matters even more, and each additional percentage point increases the chance of success by 0.65% on average, *ceteris paribus*. A one-unit (one coauthor) increase in the average team

size increases the chance of success by 0.5%; however, a relatively wide confidence interval (1.0026–1.0073) limits the importance of this characteristic for high publishing productivity.

Finally, the only institutional predictor—institutional research intensity—was found to not be a statistically significant predictor, which may suggest that institutional aspects of scientific work may be less important (or not important at all) for high productivity compared with individual characteristics of scientists, *ceteris paribus*.

The strength of influence of all significant parameters increases as we move up the top performance scale (Table 8): predictors that increase the chances of success for the top 10% increase the chances of success even more strongly for the subsequent more selective classes of top performers.

Most notably, gender increases its impact as we move up the top performance scale. Being male as a predictor of high publishing productivity increases its influence significantly:  $\text{Exp}(B)$  increases from 1.418 (95% confidence interval: 1.378–1.459) for the top 10% to 2.277 (95% confidence interval: 2.077–2.497) for the top 1%. The more selective the class of top-productivity is, the higher the chances for men (and the lower the chances for women) to enter it.

The confidence intervals widen as the classes of top performers narrow, which means that the precision of the estimation decreases (without leading to the nonsignificance of predictors). This is because of the properties of techniques from the family of logit generalized linear models, which favor the dependent variables for which the proportion of successes and failures is as close to 50/50 as possible (model fit, see Supplementary Table 6). Counter-intuitively, for all classes of top performers, even for the most narrow class of the top 1%, and for all four productivity measurements, institutional research intensity is statistically insignificant.

### 4.3.1. Fixed Effects

We analyzed one productivity measurement and one top-productivity class (Productivity 1: prestige-normalized, full counting; the top 10%). The values of the fixed effects for each period steadily decrease over time (Supplementary Table 7), which implies that, in successive periods, it becomes increasingly difficult to belong to the top 10%. There is increasing competition in academia through an overall increase in the number of publications. The highest values in such disciplines as MED and ENER imply that, in these disciplines, there is lower competition to belong to the top 10% (compared with the average for the model for all disciplines). The lowest values observed for PHYS, CHEM, BIO, and MATH indicate high competition in these disciplines.

We also analyzed one productivity measurement (Productivity 1) and all top performers classes. The values of fixed effects decrease as the classes of top performers narrow from the top 10% to the top 1%, meaning that it is relatively more difficult to get into the narrower classes of top-productivity scientists (Supplementary Table 8). At the same time, for each class of top performers, the values of fixed effects decrease with each successive period, meaning that the competition is increasing over time.

In each successive period, entering the class of each top performer class is more difficult, with the most difficult class to enter being the top 1% in the 2016–2021 period. The downward trend in fixed effects over successive periods indicates increasing competition in academia and increasing publishing productivity requirements to be among the most productive scientists.

In terms of disciplines, the direction of the influence of fixed effects is relatively constant for each top performers class. In some disciplines (e.g., ENG, MED, and PHARM), positive values of fixed effects for all classes of top performers are maintained. In these disciplines, it is relatively easier to become a member of the top performer class (compared with the average for the models for all disciplines). In contrast, in other disciplines (e.g., BIO and MATH), negative values of fixed effects are consistently maintained, which means that, in these disciplines, it is relatively more difficult to become a top performer. The values of fixed effects decrease with the narrowing of the classes of top performers for CHEM, EARTH, MATH, and PHYS (so that more selective classes of top performers are associated with increasing relative difficulty of entering them).

In practical terms, some disciplines are more competitive and require much more effort compared with the average effort in these disciplines (measured in terms of publications) to be in the top-productivity classes; other disciplines are less competitive, requiring less effort to achieve the same high productivity status.

## 5. Discussion and Conclusions

In the current research, the contribution of top performers to the total national research output in Poland was examined from temporal (1992–2021) and disciplinary (15 STEMM disciplines) perspectives. Four classes of top performers (the upper 1%, 3%, 5%, and 10% of scientists in terms of publishing productivity) were examined over five 6-year periods into which the study period was divided, separately within the disciplines, using four major measurements of productivity. We examined a large population of all internationally – through Scopus indexed publications – visible Polish scientists (between N=23,166 scientists in the first period and N=93,092 scientists in the last period) and a large sample of top performers (between N=2400 in the first period and N=9337 in the last period for the top 10%).

Our methodological approach had four major attributes: it was longitudinal, relative, classificatory, and journal prestige-normalized. The longitudinal nature of our study allowed us to track scientists over time for the entire study period or as long as they were publishing (attrition in Polish science is one of the lowest among 38 OECD countries recently studied and reaches 33% for women and 25% for men for all disciplines combined after 10 years for the cohort 2000; see Kwiek and Szymula 2024). Its relative nature allowed us to use rankings of scientists by productivity percentile for each period rather than their actual publication numbers. Its classificatory nature allowed us to use a binary distinction between the classes of top performers and the rest of the scientists. Finally, its prestige-normalized nature allowed us to use a vertically stratified structure of the global journal system in productivity computations.

Our results show that the contribution of top performers to the total national research output is surprisingly stable over time: Although the social and economic world around experienced powerful transformations, and academic science was probably undergoing the biggest shifts in its recent history, Polish top performers in the three decades of 1992–2021 played a structurally similar, fundamental role.

Under normalization of publishing productivity to journal prestige (prestige-normalized, full-counting approach), the top 1%, on average, account for 10% of the national output, and the top 10% account for almost 50% of the national output, with significant disciplinary variations. The 1/10 rule and 10/50 rule consistently apply to the Polish case across the three decades studied.

In practical terms, the two rules mean that if the upper 1% of scientists stopped doing science, the national output would be cut by 10%; and if the upper 10% of scientists stopped doing science, the national output would be halved. We could have expected the scale of their potential contributions based on previous cross-sectional, small-scale and survey-based research (Kwiek 2016; Kwiek 2018), but a comprehensive longitudinal approach presented in the present paper was not possible before the advent of comprehensive datasets: our Laboratory of Polish Science provides access to a complete national registry of Polish scientists combined with the complete Scopus raw dataset.

Our research is not cross-sectional, with results valid for a single point in time (e.g., two to four years), as in traditional academic profession surveys. With panel data, long-term processes can be examined. The proportions of contributions made by top performers hardly change over time; the processes of concentration of research output in the hands of the most productive scientists are not observed.

A possible explanation is that the distribution of highly productive scientists among subsequent cohorts of Polish scientists is relatively stable over time, and it may be related to cumulative advantage processes in an underfunded science system as well as to the distribution of individual motivation, high quality doctoral training, innate ability, and possibly luck (Allison and Stewart 1974; Stephan 2012). The population of Polish scientists may be structurally divided into its small and much more productive (motivated, well-trained, able and lucky) segments and the rest. The proportions of output produced by scientists from subsequent percentiles of productivity seem relatively stable over time: Both the upper 1% and upper 10% have their stable shares.

Top performers classes emerge in the current research as heterogeneous classes in terms of gender and age (or publishing experience) groups. Women in the top 10% are responsible for about 35–37% of all publications produced by women. And the concentration of output is higher for men in the top 10% who are responsible for more than 50% of all publications produced by men.

The concentration of output increases with age groups so that midcareer and late-career top performers—scientists with at least 20 years of publishing experience—from the top 10% class are responsible for more than 60% of all publications in this age group.

There are significant disciplinary variations, with the highest concentration in PHARM and the lowest in MATHS. A generally lower concentration for MATHS (in the range of 35% to 40%) may indicate that mathematicians are less vertically stratified in terms of publishing productivity: They contribute more equally to the total output in mathematics compared with other disciplines. It may be more difficult to be radically more productive than others in mathematics because mathematicians (from 898 in the first period to 2,244 in the last period) may generally be quite productive, with a higher percentage of solo papers and papers published in relatively small teams than in other STEM disciplines.

To quantify the over-representation of men in the top performers classes from cross-disciplinary and temporal perspectives, we constructed what we have termed the Relative Presence Index or the RPI. Men are over-represented in all classes of top performers, and their over-representation increases when moving up the high-performance scale. In terms of academic age groups, the RPI for men generally decreases: The oldest men are over-represented the most, and the youngest men are over-represented the least, indicating generational changes in the Polish science sector.

Our econometric models lead to several interesting conclusions (logit generalized linear models with fixed effects, fixed effects being periods, and academic disciplines). First, the model for the top 10% identifies three important predictors that increase the chances of membership in the top 10%. These

are gender, academic age, and publishing patterns. Men, on average, have significantly higher chances of success (41.8%); each additional year of publishing increases the chances by 7.4%; and an increase in the median journal percentile rank in a given period by one unit increases the chances by 2.7%. The chances of success are, on average, substantially higher for men with long publishing histories.

Second, counter-intuitively, for all classes of top performers, institutional research intensity is statistically insignificant. The role of institutions compared with the role of individual characteristics is zero.

Third, an analysis of fixed effects indicates that, over time, it is increasingly difficult to enter the top 10% (in all productivity measurements), which testifies to the increasing competition in academia. It is relatively more difficult to enter more selective top performers classes, the most difficult class to enter being the top 1% in the latest period of 2016–2021. However, the odds ratio estimates vary significantly between disciplines. Some disciplines emerge from our research as more competitive than others, requiring more scholarly effort (measured in terms of publications) to enter top-productivity classes compared with the average effort in these disciplines.

Finally, in the current research, there are several limitations related to the data and methodology. Our sample includes all Polish scientists in the STEM disciplines whose research articles (and papers in conference proceedings) have been indexed in the Scopus dataset from 1992–2021. As a result, scientists without so defined output are not included in the sample. However, it is extremely rare for scientists working in STEM disciplines in Poland not to publish in Scopus-indexed journals.

The present research required several proxies to be used; these included the classification of disciplines, academic age, median journal percentile rank, and institutional research intensity. We have used a commercial classification of disciplines (Scopus ASJC classification) rather than the various national classifications applied in Polish national research assessment exercises over the past 30 years. Our Laboratory includes the year of birth (coming from the national registry of Polish scientists) for a large number of scientists in our sample but not for all of them. Therefore, we have decided to use academic age (the time elapsed since the first publication) as a proxy of biological age (see Kwiek and Roszka 2022). In prestige-normalized productivity computations, we have used the most recent Scopus CiteScore percentile ranks (2023) because the percentile ranks for the whole period of study are not publicly available.

Finally, from several approaches to select a class of Polish research-intensive institutions, our choice was to use the most recent ministerial classification (research-intensive institutions vs. the rest), with the current vertical stratification of institutions—as in the case of the current vertical stratification of Scopus journals above—applied retrospectively for the whole study period. With no standardized reliable data for the past, in both cases, we assumed a higher stability of journal prestige and of research intensity of institutions over time than in fact may have been the case in 1992–2021. These limitations reflect the trade-offs that had to be made to meaningfully study Polish top performers from longitudinal and cross-disciplinary perspectives.

*This paper is accompanied by Electronic Supplementary Material available online.*

## **Funding information**

We gratefully acknowledge the support provided by the MEiN NDS grant no. NdS/529032/2021/2021. We also gratefully acknowledge the assistance of the International Center

for the Study of Research (ICSR) Lab and Kristy James, Senior Data Scientist. We want to thank Lukasz Szymula from the CPPS Poznan Team for his support with Scopus data analyses.

## Author contributions

Marek Kwiek: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Software, Validation, Writing—original draft, Writing—review & editing. Wojciech Roszka: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Software, Validation, Visualization, Writing—original draft, Writing—review & editing.

## Data availability

We used data from Scopus, a proprietary scientometric database. For legal reasons, data from Scopus received through collaboration with the ICSR Lab cannot be made openly available.

## Declarations

Declarations of interest: none

## Bibliography

- Abramo, G., D'Angelo, C. A., & Caprasecca, A. (2009). The contribution of star scientists to overall sex differences in research productivity. *Scientometrics*, *81*(1), 137–156.
- Abramo, G., D'Angelo, C. A., & Di Costa, F. (2011). Research productivity: Are higher academic ranks more productive than lower ones? *Scientometrics*, *88*(3), 915–928.
- Abramo, G., D'Angelo, C. A., & Soldatenkova, A. (2017). How long do top scientists maintain their stardom? An analysis by region, gender and discipline: Evidence from Italy. *Scientometrics* *110*, 867–877.
- Agrawal, A., McHale, J., & Oettl, A. (2017). How stars matter: Recruiting and peer effects in evolutionary biology. *Research Policy*, *46*(4), 853–867.
- Aguinis, H., & O'Boyle, E. (2014). Star performers in twenty-first century organizations. *Personnel Psychology*, *67*(2), 313–350.
- Allison, P. D., & Stewart, J. A. (1974). Productivity differences among scientists: Evidence for accumulative advantage. *American Sociological Review*, *39*(4), 596–606.
- Antonowicz, D., Kulczycki, E., & Budzanowska, A. (2020). Breaking the deadlock of mistrust? A participative model of the structural reforms in higher education in Poland. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *74*(4), 391–409.
- Carrasco, R., & Ruiz-Castillo, J. (2014). The evolution of the scientific productivity of highly productive economists. *Economic Inquiry*, *52*(1), 1–16.
- Cole, J. R., & Cole, S. (1973). *Social stratification in science*. University of Chicago Press.
- Cortés, L. M., Mora-Valencia, A., & Perote, J. (2016). The productivity of top researchers: A semi-nonparametric approach. *Scientometrics*, *109*(2), 891–915.
- Costas, R., van Leeuwen, T. N., & Bordons, M. (2010). Self-citations at the meso and individual levels: Effects of different calculation methods. *Scientometrics*, *82*, 517–537.
- Crane, D. (1965). Scientists at major and minor universities: A study of productivity and recognition. *American Sociological Review*, *30*(5), 699–714.
- David, P. A. (1994). Positive feedbacks and research productivity in science: Reopening another black box. In O. Granstrand (Ed.), *Economics of technology* (pp. 65–89). Elsevier.
- Donina, D., Pokorska, A., Antonowicz, D. & Jaworska, M. (2022) A cultural perspective of higher education governance reform in Poland: divergent interpretations by rectors across distinct categories of universities, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *44*(6), 596–612,
- Fernández-Val, I. and M. Weidner (2016). Individual and time effects in nonlinear panel models with large N, T. *Journal of Econometrics*, *192*(1), 291–312.

- Fox, M. F., & Mohapatra, S. (2007). Social-organizational characteristics of work and publication productivity among academic scientists in doctoral-granting departments. *Journal of Higher Education*, 78(5), 542–571.
- Fox, M. F., & Nikivincze, I. (2021). Being highly prolific in academic science: Characteristics of individuals and their departments. *Higher Education*, 81, 1237–1255.
- Halevi, G., Moed, H. F., & Bar-Ilan, J. (2015). Researchers' mobility, productivity and impact: Case of top producing authors in seven disciplines. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 32(1), 22–37.
- Hermanowicz, J. (2012). The sociology of academic careers: Problems and prospects. In J. C. Smart & M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research 27* (pp. 207–248).
- Hinz, J., A. Stammann, and J. Wanner (2020). State dependence and unobserved heterogeneity in the extensive margin of trade. *ArXiv e-prints*.
- Ioannidis, J. P. A., Boyack, K. W., & Klavans, R. (2014). Estimates of the continuously publishing core in the scientific workforce. *PLOSOne*.
- Kelchtermans, S., & Veugelers, R. (2013). Top research productivity and its persistence: Gender as a double-edged sword. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 95(1), 273–285.
- Kiewra, K. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2000). Conversations with three highly productive educational psychologists: Richard Anderson, Richard Mayer, and Michael Pressley. *Educational Psychology Review*, 12(1), 135–161.
- Kwiek, M. (2016). The European research elite: A cross-national study of highly productive academics across 11 European systems. *Higher Education*, 71(3), 379–397.
- Kwiek, M. (2018). High research productivity in vertically undifferentiated higher education systems: Who are the top performers? *Scientometrics*, 115(1), 415–462.
- Kwiek, M., Roszka, W. (2021). Gender-based homophily in research: A large-scale study of man-woman collaboration. *Journal of Informetrics*, 15(3), 1–38.
- Kwiek, M., Roszka, W. (2022). Academic vs. biological age in research on academic careers: a large-scale study with implications for scientifically developing systems. *Scientometrics*, 127, 3543–3575.
- Kwiek, M., Roszka, W. (2024). Once highly productive, forever highly productive? Full professors' research productivity from a longitudinal perspective. *Higher Education*, 87, 519–549.
- Kwiek, M., Szymula, L. (2023). Young male and female scientists: A quantitative exploratory study of the changing demographics of the global scientific workforce. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 4(4), 902–937.
- Leisyte, L. and Dee, J.D. (2012). Understanding academic work in changing institutional environment. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, 27, 123–206.
- Mayrath, M. C. (2008). Attributions of productive authors in educational psychology journals. *Educational Psychology Review*, 20(1), 41–56.
- Nygaard, L. P., Aksnes, D. W., & Piro, F. N. (2022). Identifying gender disparities in research performance: The importance of comparing apples with apples. *Higher Education*. 84, 1127–1142.
- O'Boyle Jr., E., Aguinis, H. (2012). The best and the rest: Revisiting the norm of normality of individual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 65(1), 79–119.
- Parker, J. N., Lortie, C., & Allesina, S. (2010). Characterizing a scientific elite: The social characteristics of the most highly cited scientists in environmental science and ecology. *Scientometrics*, 85(1), 129–143.
- Piro, F. N., Rørstad, K., & Aksnes, D. W. (2016). How do prolific professors influence the citation impact of their university departments? *Scientometrics*, 107(3), 941–961.
- Rosen, S. (1981). The economics of superstars. *The American Economic Review*, 71(5), 846–858.
- Ruiz-Castillo, J., & Costas, R. (2014). The skewness of scientific productivity. *Journal of Informetrics*, 8(4), 917–934.
- Seglen, P. O. (1992). The skewness of science. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 43(9), 628–638.
- Serenko, A., Cox, R. A. K., Bontis, N., & Booker, L. D. (2011). The superstar phenomenon in the knowledge management and intellectual capital academic discipline. *Journal of Informetrics*, 5(3), 333–345.
- Sidiropoulos, A., Gogoglou, A., Katsaros, D., & Manolopoulos, Y. (2016). Gazing at the skyline for star scientists. *Journal of Informetrics*, 10(3), 789–813.
- Stammann, A. (2018). Fast and feasible estimation of generalized linear models with high dimensional k-way fixed effects. *ArXiv e-prints*.
- Stephan, P. (2012). *How economics shapes science*. Harvard University Press.

- Tang, L. & Horta, H. (2023). Supporting Academic Women's Careers: Male and Female Academics' Perspectives at a Chinese Research University. *Minerva*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11024-023-09506-y>
- Turner, L., & Mairesse, J. (2005). *Individual productivity differences in public research: How important are non-individual determinants? An econometric study of French physicists' publications and citations (1986–1997)*. CNRS.
- Xie, Y. (2014). 'Undemocracy': Inequalities in science. *Science*, 344(6186), 809–810.



## Electronic Supplementary Material to:

### **Marek Kwiek**

- 1) Center for Public Policy Studies, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan, Poland
- 2) German Center for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW), Berlin, Germany  
[kwiekm@amu.edu.pl](mailto:kwiekm@amu.edu.pl), ORCID: [orcid.org/0000-0001-7953-1063](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7953-1063)

### **Wojciech Roszka**

- 1) Poznan University of Economics and Business, Poznan, Poland
- 2) Center for Public Policy Studies, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan, Poland  
[wojciech.roszka@ue.poznan.pl](mailto:wojciech.roszka@ue.poznan.pl), ORCID: [orcid.org/0000-0003-4383-3259](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4383-3259)

## **Top Research Performance Over Time: A Multidimensional Micro-Data Approach**

**Supplementary Table 1.** The distribution (for Productivity 1) of the subsample of top performers classes (the top 10%, 5%, 3%, and 1% scientists in terms of productivity) by six-year period, gender, institutional type, and academic age (publishing experience) group (% and frequencies).

		10%		5%		3%		1%	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1992-1997	female	649	27.0	301	25.0	157	21.8	33	13.7
	male	1751	73.0	901	75.0	562	78.2	208	86.3
	Total	2400	100.0	1202	100.0	719	100.0	241	100.0
1998-2003	female	1135	30.7	498	27.0	248	22.4	73	19.5
	male	2567	69.3	1348	73.0	861	77.6	301	80.5
	Total	3702	100.0	1846	100.0	1109	100.0	374	100.0
2004-2009	female	1823	33.4	808	29.6	420	25.6	124	22.5
	male	3640	66.6	1918	70.4	1222	74.4	426	77.5
	Total	5463	100.0	2726	100.0	1642	100.0	550	100.0
2010-2015	female	2755	35.9	1207	31.4	665	28.9	189	24.5
	male	4927	64.1	2634	68.6	1636	71.1	581	75.5
	Total	7682	100.0	3841	100.0	2301	100.0	770	100.0
2016-2021	female	3669	39.3	1653	35.4	913	32.6	240	25.7
	male	5668	60.7	3013	64.6	1884	67.4	694	74.3
	Total	9337	100.0	4666	100.0	2797	100.0	934	100.0
1992-1997	Research-intensive	645	26.9	299	24.9	186	25.9	61	25.3
	Rest	1755	73.1	903	75.1	533	74.1	180	74.7
	Total	2400	100.0	1202	100.0	719	100.0	241	100.0
1998-2003	Research-intensive	1016	27.4	522	28.3	323	29.1	119	31.8
	Rest	2686	72.6	1324	71.7	786	70.9	255	68.2
	Total	3702	100.0	1846	100.0	1109	100.0	374	100.0
2004-2009	Research-intensive	1521	27.8	756	27.7	455	27.7	163	29.6
	Rest	3942	72.2	1970	72.3	1187	72.3	387	70.4
	Total	5463	100.0	2726	100.0	1642	100.0	550	100.0
2010-2015	Research-intensive	2189	28.5	1089	28.4	656	28.5	228	29.6
	Rest	5493	71.5	2752	71.6	1645	71.5	542	70.4
	Total	7682	100.0	3841	100.0	2301	100.0	770	100.0
2016-2021	Research-intensive	2564	27.5	1281	27.5	777	27.8	271	29.0
	Rest	6773	72.5	3385	72.5	2020	72.2	663	71.0
	Total	9337	100.0	4666	100.0	2797	100.0	934	100.0
1992-1997	0-9 years	763	31.8	317	26.4	160	22.3	44	18.3
	10-19 years	860	35.8	439	36.5	255	35.5	70	29.0
	20-29 years	642	26.8	366	30.4	247	34.4	101	41.9
	30 and more years	135	5.6	80	6.7	57	7.9	26	10.8
	Total	2400	100.0	1202	100.0	719	100.0	241	100.0
1998-2003	0-9 years	1103	29.8	390	21.1	206	18.6	52	13.9
	10-19 years	1224	33.1	624	33.8	371	33.5	108	28.9
	20-29 years	999	27.0	595	32.2	365	32.9	145	38.8
	30 and more years	376	10.2	237	12.8	167	15.1	69	18.4
	Total	3702	100.0	1846	100.0	1109	100.0	374	100.0
2004-2009	0-9 years	1404	25.7	546	20.0	287	17.5	56	10.2
	10-19 years	2014	36.9	1008	37.0	578	35.2	178	32.4
	20-29 years	1167	21.4	652	23.9	423	25.8	158	28.7
	30 and more years	878	16.1	520	19.1	354	21.6	158	28.7
	Total	5463	100.0	2726	100.0	1642	100.0	550	100.0
2010-2015	0-9 years	1708	22.2	649	16.9	329	14.3	73	9.5
	10-19 years	3239	42.2	1592	41.4	904	39.3	285	37.0
	20-29 years	1478	19.2	857	22.3	554	24.1	200	26.0
	30 and more years	1257	16.4	743	19.3	514	22.3	212	27.5
	Total	7682	100.0	3841	100.0	2301	100.0	770	100.0
2016-2021	0-9 years	1893	20.3	751	16.1	391	14.0	84	9.0

	10-19 years	3862	41.4	1948	41.7	1145	40.9	358	38.3
	20-29 years	2298	24.6	1226	26.3	791	28.3	302	32.3
	30 and more years	1284	13.8	741	15.9	470	16.8	190	20.3
	Total	9337	100.0	4666	100.0	2797	100.0	934	100.0

**Supplementary Table 2.** The Relative Presence Index (RPI) for men (left panels) and for women (right panels) top performers, the top 5% and top 3% classes (in terms of productivity) by six-year period, academic age group, and STEMM discipline (Productivity 1: prestige-normalized, full counting)

Variable	Category	1992-1997	1998-2003	2004-2009	2010-2015	2016-2021	1992-1997	1998-2003	2004-2009	2010-2015	2016-2021
		<b>Men</b>					<b>Women</b>				
		<i>The top 5%</i>									
<b>Academic age</b>	0-9 years	1.87	1.64	1.68	1.79	2.29	0.53	0.61	0.60	0.56	0.44
	10-19 years	1.26	1.57	1.56	1.47	1.29	0.79	0.64	0.64	0.68	0.77
	20-29 years	1.66	1.32	1.35	1.42	1.26	0.60	0.76	0.74	0.70	0.79
	30 & more years	1.28	1.40	1.28	1.21	1.27	0.78	0.71	0.78	0.82	0.78
<b>Discipline</b>	AGRI	1.90	1.51	1.92	2.00	1.69	0.53	0.66	0.52	0.50	0.59
	BIO	2.39	3.48	3.62	2.71	2.63	0.42	0.29	0.28	0.37	0.38
	CHEM	2.12	2.31	2.23	2.41	1.97	0.47	0.43	0.45	0.41	0.51
	CHEMENG	3.15	6.91	2.81	7.11	5.41	0.32	0.14	0.36	0.14	0.18
	COMP	-	0.65	0.94	0.87	1.54	-	1.53	1.07	1.15	0.65
	EARTH	3.47	1.83	2.13	2.47	1.87	0.29	0.55	0.47	0.41	0.54
	ENER	-	0.48	1.26	0.99	1.59	-	2.10	0.79	1.01	0.63
	ENG	7.64	2.84	1.88	2.69	2.24	0.13	0.35	0.53	0.37	0.45
	ENVIR	0.95	0.99	1.26	1.18	1.30	1.05	1.01	0.80	0.85	0.77
	MATER	1.43	1.65	1.55	1.98	1.56	0.70	0.61	0.65	0.51	0.64
	MATH	5.02	17.84	2.68	1.64	1.53	0.20	0.06	0.37	0.61	0.65
	MED	1.45	1.81	2.19	2.26	2.11	0.69	0.55	0.46	0.44	0.47
	NEURO	1.59	2.42	1.28	1.51	1.84	0.63	0.41	0.78	0.66	0.54
	PHARM	0.71	0.71	1.00	1.28	1.42	1.41	1.40	1.00	0.78	0.71
	PHYS	1.86	1.91	1.77	2.19	2.20	0.54	0.52	0.57	0.46	0.45
	<b>All dis. combined</b>	<b>1.73</b>	<b>1.92</b>	<b>2.04</b>	<b>2.03</b>	<b>1.87</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>0.53</b>
		<i>The top 3%</i>									
<b>Academic age</b>	0-9 years	1.89	2.33	2.03	2.27	2.58	0.53	0.43	0.49	0.44	0.39
	10-19 years	1.97	1.83	1.93	1.60	1.51	0.51	0.55	0.52	0.62	0.66
	20-29 years	1.66	1.74	1.59	1.45	1.36	0.60	0.58	0.63	0.69	0.74
	30 & more years	1.50	1.64	1.48	1.30	1.37	0.67	0.61	0.68	0.77	0.73
<b>Discipline</b>	AGRI	1.96	1.67	2.14	2.55	2.04	0.51	0.60	0.47	0.39	0.49
	BIO	2.91	4.92	5.10	3.14	2.83	0.34	0.20	0.20	0.32	0.35
	CHEM	2.64	3.45	3.31	2.59	2.16	0.38	0.29	0.30	0.39	0.46
	CHEMENG	1.72	-	3.58	8.53	4.81	0.58	-	0.28	0.12	0.21
	COMP	-	1.30	1.15	1.28	2.06	-	0.77	0.87	0.78	0.48
	EARTH	2.47	2.02	2.19	2.50	2.22	0.41	0.50	0.46	0.40	0.45
	ENER	-	0.72	1.52	1.08	3.26	-	1.40	0.66	0.93	0.31
	ENG	-	8.98	2.08	2.93	2.54	-	0.11	0.48	0.34	0.39
	ENVIR	1.53	1.71	1.53	1.58	1.64	0.65	0.59	0.65	0.63	0.61
	MATER	1.72	2.01	1.49	1.88	1.87	0.58	0.50	0.67	0.53	0.54
	MATH	-	-	3.26	1.42	2.25	-	-	0.31	0.71	0.45
	MED	1.78	2.32	2.71	2.56	2.33	0.56	0.43	0.37	0.39	0.43
	NEURO	1.76	2.31	2.05	1.04	1.79	0.57	0.43	0.49	0.96	0.56
	PHARM	0.77	0.89	0.57	1.02	1.44	1.30	1.12	1.75	0.98	0.69
	PHYS	2.44	2.10	2.23	3.09	2.73	0.41	0.48	0.45	0.32	0.37
	<b>All dis. combined</b>	<b>2.07</b>	<b>2.46</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.28</b>	<b>2.12</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>0.41</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>0.47</b>

**Supplementary Table 3.** Logistic regression with fixed effects estimates (fixed effects: periods and disciplines), odds ratio estimates of membership in the class of the top 5%, top 3%, and top 1% (in terms of productivity), by productivity measurement

Top performers class	variable	Productivity 2 (prestige-normalized, fractional counting)				Productivity 3 (non-normalized, full counting)				Productivity 4 (non-normalized, fractional counting)			
		LB	Exp(B)	UB	Pr(>  z )	LB	Exp(B)	UB	Pr(>  z )	LB	Exp(B)	UB	Pr(>  z )
The top 10%	Academic age in period	1.073	1.074	1.075	0.000	1.072	1.073	1.074	0.000	1.071	1.072	1.073	0.000
	Average team size in period	1.006	1.009	1.011	0.000	0.892	0.898	0.903	0.000	0.899	0.904	0.910	0.000
	International collaboration rate in period	1.006	1.006	1.007	0.000	1.005	1.005	1.006	0.000	1.005	1.005	1.006	0.000
	Collaboration rate in period	1.003	1.004	1.005	0.000	0.987	0.987	0.988	0.000	0.986	0.987	0.987	0.000
	Gender: Male	1.416	1.457	1.500	0.000	1.375	1.415	1.456	0.000	1.393	1.433	1.474	0.000
	Institutional research intensity: Rest	0.962	0.992	1.023	0.616	0.970	1.000	1.031	0.994	0.973	1.003	1.033	0.856
	Median journal percentile rank in period	1.007	1.008	1.008	0.000	1.026	1.027	1.028	0.000	1.006	1.006	1.007	0.000
The top 5%	Academic age in period	1.073	1.075	1.076	0.000	1.070	1.071	1.073	0.000	1.069	1.071	1.072	0.000
	Average team size in period	1.008	1.011	1.013	0.000	0.889	0.896	0.903	0.000	0.895	0.902	0.910	0.000
	International collaboration rate in period	1.007	1.008	1.008	0.000	1.005	1.006	1.007	0.000	1.005	1.006	1.007	0.000
	Collaboration rate in period	1.004	1.005	1.007	0.000	0.987	0.988	0.988	0.000	0.987	0.987	0.988	0.000
	Gender: Male	1.619	1.686	1.756	0.000	1.486	1.546	1.608	0.000	1.498	1.557	1.619	0.000
	Institutional research intensity: Rest	0.947	0.986	1.028	0.518	0.967	1.007	1.048	0.749	0.981	1.022	1.064	0.296
	Median journal percentile rank in period	1.007	1.008	1.009	0.000	1.027	1.028	1.029	0.000	1.006	1.007	1.007	0.000
The top 3%	Academic age in period	1.075	1.077	1.079	0.000	1.069	1.071	1.073	0.000	1.069	1.071	1.073	0.000
	Average team size in period	1.006	1.010	1.013	0.000	0.885	0.894	0.903	0.000	0.891	0.900	0.910	0.000
	International collaboration rate in period	1.008	1.009	1.009	0.000	1.006	1.006	1.007	0.000	1.006	1.006	1.007	0.000
	Collaboration rate in period	1.005	1.007	1.008	0.000	0.987	0.988	0.989	0.000	0.987	0.988	0.988	0.000
	Gender: Male	1.718	1.810	1.907	0.000	1.607	1.690	1.777	0.000	1.550	1.630	1.714	0.000
	Institutional research intensity: Rest	0.963	1.015	1.070	0.572	0.944	0.994	1.045	0.805	0.960	1.010	1.063	0.696
	Median journal percentile rank in period	1.008	1.009	1.010	0.000	1.028	1.029	1.030	0.000	1.006	1.007	1.008	0.000
The top 1%	Academic age in period	1.079	1.082	1.085	0.000	1.070	1.073	1.076	0.000	1.071	1.074	1.077	0.000
	Average team size in period	1.005	1.010	1.015	0.000	0.885	0.900	0.915	0.000	0.880	0.896	0.913	0.000
	International collaboration rate in period	1.008	1.009	1.011	0.000	1.006	1.007	1.009	0.000	1.007	1.008	1.009	0.000
	Collaboration rate in period	1.004	1.007	1.010	0.000	0.986	0.988	0.990	0.000	0.986	0.987	0.989	0.000
	Gender: Male	2.094	2.299	2.525	0.000	1.928	2.109	2.308	0.000	1.782	1.947	2.127	0.000
	Institutional research intensity: Rest	0.886	0.966	1.054	0.435	0.916	0.998	1.087	0.966	0.898	0.977	1.064	0.598
	Median journal percentile rank in period	1.009	1.011	1.012	0.000	1.029	1.031	1.033	0.000	1.004	1.005	1.007	0.000

### Analysis of pairwise correlation of productivity measurements

Pairwise correlation analysis was conducted between four productivity measurements in terms of domains defined by discipline, academic age groups, gender, and institutional type. These analyses were carried out for each period and each top performers class. The overall conclusion is that the correlations between full-counting productivity measurements (Productivities 1 and 3) and between fractional counting productivity measurements (Productivities 2 and 4) are always very strong ( $r > 0.9$ ), while correlations between productivity measurements from two separate classes (Productivities 1 and 3; 2 and 3; 2 and 4; and 1 and 4) are strong at best ( $0.7 < r < 0.9$ ).

### Inverse correlation matrix analysis for the assumption of the lack of collinearity

To check the assumption of the lack of multicollinearity in the vector of independent variables, the inverse matrix correlation method was used. The matrix of Pearson linear correlation coefficients between all pairs of independent variables was calculated, and then, the matrix was inverted. Vector of variables used in the model is correlated with each other to a nonsignificant degree (Supplementary Table 4). The values on the main diagonals of the inverted correlation matrices are only slightly different from 1 (where 1 means zero degree of multivariate correlation in the arrangement of variables).

**Supplementary Table 4.** The main diagonals of the inverted correlation matrices of the independent variables

	1992-1997	1998-2003	2004-2009	2010-2015	2016-2021
Academic age in period	1.01	1.03	1.04	1.04	1.04
Average team size in period	1.12	1.13	1.12	1.16	1.15
International collaboration rate in period	1.14	1.14	1.15	1.17	1.16
Collaboration rate in period	1.07	1.07	1.06	1.06	1.05
Gender: Male	1.02	1.03	1.04	1.05	1.05
Institutional research intensity: Rest	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.02	1.01
Median journal percentile rank in period	1.02	1.04	1.06	1.07	1.07

**Supplementary Table 5.** Confidence intervals (95%) overlaps for logistic regression parameters estimates by independent variables and dependent variables. Interval estimates for independent variables (Column 1) for models for a given productivity measurement (Column 2)—overlaps with analogous interval estimates for a given productivity measurement (Column 3)

Variable	Top performers by productivity measurement	Overlaps with interval estimates for productivity measurement			
		1	2	3	4
Academic age	Productivity 1	1	2	3	4
	Productivity 2	1	2	3	4
	Productivity 3	1	2	3	4
	Productivity 4	1	2	3	4
Average team size	Productivity 1	1	2		
	Productivity 2	1	2		
	Productivity 3			3	4
	Productivity 4			3	4
International collaboration rate	Productivity 1	1	2		
	Productivity 2	1	2		
	Productivity 3			3	4
	Productivity 4			3	4
Collaboration rate	Productivity 1	1	2		
	Productivity 2	1	2		
	Productivity 3			3	4
	Productivity 4			3	4
Gender: Male	Productivity 1	1	2	3	4
	Productivity 2	1	2	3	4
	Productivity 3	1	2	3	4
	Productivity 4	1	2	3	4
Research intensity: Rest	Productivity 1	1	2	3	4
	Productivity 2	1	2	3	4
	Productivity 3	1	2	3	4
	Productivity 4	1	2	3	4
Median journal prestige	Productivity 1	1		3	
	Productivity 2		2		
	Productivity 3	1		3	
	Productivity 4				4

## Model fit

The models explain from about 11% (Productivity 4, the top 1%) to about 16.4% (Productivity 1, the top 1%, Supplementary Table 11) of the variation in the dependent variable. There is an increase in the variation explained for Productivity 1 and Productivity 2 (prestige-normalized), along with more narrowed classes of top performers (from the top 10% to the top 1%). The increase in McFadden's  $R^2$  as top performers classes become more selective may indicate that the factors included in the models, such as academic age, collaboration rate, and academic discipline, have a greater impact and are better able to explain differences in productivity among the most productive scientists. In particular, this may indicate that publication quality (accounted for by journal prestige normalization) plays a key role in defining the top performers.

For Productivity 3 and Productivity 4, where journal prestige normalization does not apply, the quality of the models decreases as the class of top performers narrows. This may suggest that, in the models that do not capture publication quality directly through journal prestige normalization, it is more difficult to explain what exactly increase the odds of scientists to belong to the narrow class of the most productive scientists. This difficulty may be because of the failure to capture journal prestige – which, in turn, indicates high importance of publication quality.

At the same time, a higher explanatory power of the models for full-counting approaches (Productivity 1 and Productivity 3) than for fractional counting approaches (Productivity 2 and Productivity 4). This may indicate that the contribution of scientists is better reflected when the number of coauthors is not taken into account, especially in the disciplines where large research teams are the norm. Although the determination coefficients are far from 1, they rarely exceed 0.4 for logit generalized linear models, so the estimated models fit the empirical data at least moderately.

**Supplementary Table 6.** McFadden's R-squares for the models

Top performers class / Productivity measurement	Productivity 1 (prestige-normalized, full counting)	Productivity 2 (prestige-normalized, fractional counting)	Productivity 3 (non-normalized, full counting)	Productivity 4 (non-normalized, fractional counting)
The top 10%	0.152	0.113	0.155	0.120
The top 5%	0.155	0.118	0.150	0.113
The top 3%	0.156	0.123	0.148	0.111
The top 1%	0.164	0.132	0.144	0.109

## Fixed effects

We also analyzed all productivity measurements and one top-productivity class (Productivity 1 through 4; the top 10%). The values of fixed effects for the periods show a downward trend, suggesting that it is becoming increasingly difficult to be in the top 10% over time across all productivity measurements (Supplementary Table 5). The largest declines are observed for Productivity 1. This implies that it is relatively more difficult to become a top performer in terms of prestige-normalized full-counting productivity, while it is relatively easier in terms of the other productivity measurements.

The analysis of changes for the top 10% model from Productivity 1 to Productivity 4 shows that achieving the top performer status becomes easier if journal prestige is not measured and the fractional counting method is introduced in productivity computations. The productivity measurement that

focuses on both journal prestige normalization and full counting (Productivity 1) is the most difficult to achieve, while the non-normalized model with fractional counting (Productivity 4) offers the highest chances of being among the top 10%.

AGRI, ENVIR, MED, and ENER show positive values for all four measurements of productivity, suggesting that it is relatively easier to be among the 10% most productive scientists in these fields (compared with the average for the models for all disciplines). For CHEMENG, ENER, ENG, and MATER, positive values for Productivity 1 and Productivity 2 and negative values for Productivity 3 and Productivity 4 are observed. This implies that, in these disciplines, being in the 10% class is relatively easier in terms of prestige-normalized productivity compared with non-normalized productivity. In contrast, EARTH, MATH, and PHYS are characterized by negative fixed effects for each measurement of productivity, so regardless of productivity measurement, it is relatively more difficult to be in the top 10% class in these disciplines.



**Supplementary Table 7.** Fixed effects in the models—intercept shift (four productivity measurements, the top 10% class, fixed)

Period, Discipline / Productivity measurement	Productivity 1 (prestige-normalized, full counting)	Productivity 2 (prestige-normalized, fractional counting)	Productivity 3 (non-normalized, full counting)	Productivity 4 (non-normalized, fractional counting)
1992-1997	-4.991	-4.201	-3.094	-2.017
1998-2003	-5.185	-4.254	-3.179	-2.045
2004-2009	-5.282	-4.296	-3.171	-2.028
2010-2015	-5.423	-4.362	-3.210	-1.990
2016-2021	-5.806	-4.571	-3.442	-2.041
AGRI	0.150	0.176	0.018	0.035
BIO	-0.284	-0.127	-0.129	0.067
CHEM	-0.359	-0.239	-0.368	-0.215
CHEMENG	0.264	0.084	-0.069	-0.193
COMP	0.086	-0.029	-0.370	-0.394
EARTH	-0.063	-0.150	-0.333	-0.404
ENER	0.345	0.375	-0.039	-0.072
ENG	0.133	0.059	-0.342	-0.403
ENVIR	0.366	0.279	0.129	0.102
MATER	0.014	0.038	-0.066	-0.040
MATH	-0.244	-0.249	-0.996	-0.984
MED	0.256	0.193	0.474	0.374
NEURO	-0.130	0.045	-0.052	0.089
PHARM	-0.289	-0.444	-0.060	-0.183
PHYS	-0.682	-0.654	-0.511	-0.418

**Supplementary Table 8.** Fixed effects in the models—intercept shift (four top performers classes, Productivity 1, fixed)

Period, Discipline / Top performers class	The top 10%	The top 5%	The top 3%	The top 1%
1992-1997	-4.991	-6.165	-6.963	-8.693
1998-2003	-5.185	-6.377	-7.174	-8.921
2004-2009	-5.282	-6.479	-7.276	-9.044
2010-2015	-5.423	-6.622	-7.426	-9.209
2016-2021	-5.806	-7.011	-7.814	-9.626
AGRI	0.150	0.175	0.193	0.232
BIO	-0.284	-0.281	-0.274	-0.292
CHEM	-0.359	-0.380	-0.402	-0.438
CHEMENG	0.264	0.278	0.260	0.368
COMP	0.086	0.097	0.067	0.093
EARTH	-0.063	-0.080	-0.103	-0.115
ENER	0.345	0.380	0.389	0.524
ENG	0.133	0.125	0.122	0.131
ENVIR	0.366	0.403	0.423	0.495
MATER	0.014	0.010	-0.006	-0.017
MATH	-0.244	-0.247	-0.264	-0.325
MED	0.256	0.273	0.286	0.308
NEURO	-0.130	-0.098	-0.058	-0.025
PHARM	0.203	0.211	0.238	0.271
PHYS	-0.648	-0.727	-0.762	-0.862