Hans-Dieter Daniel

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

44 papers	2,516 citations	361045 20 h-index	233125 45 g-index
49 all docs	49 docs citations	49 times ranked	1951 citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	Lutz Bornmann: Recipient of the 2019 Derek John de Solla Price Medal. Scientometrics, 2019, 121, 1235-1238.	1.6	2
2	How to consider fractional counting and field normalization in the statistical modeling of bibliometric data: A multilevel Poisson regression approach. Journal of Informetrics, 2019, 13, 643-657.	1.4	10
3	The bibliometric quotient (BQ), or how to measure a researcherâ€™s performance capacity: A Bayesian Poisson Rasch model. Journal of Informetrics, 2018, 12, 1282-1295.	1.4	5
4	The effect of the â€œvery important paperâ€•(VIP) designation in <i>Angewandte Chemie International Edition</i> on citation impact: A propensity score matching analysis. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2017, 68, 2139-2153.	1.5	9
5	Count regression models in informetrics. Journal of Informetrics, 2016, 10, 29-30.	1.4	2
6	What is behind the curtain of the L eiden R anking?. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 1950-1953.	1.5	8
7	Testing for the fairness and predictive validity of research funding decisions: A multilevel multiple imputation for missing data approach using exâ€•ante and exâ€•post peer evaluation data from the <scp>A</scp>ustrian science fund. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 2321-2339.	1.5	15
8	Multilevelâ€•statistical reformulation of citationâ€•based university rankings: The Leiden ranking 2011/2012. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2013, 64, 1649-1658.	2.6	45
9	University and student segmentation: Multilevel latentâ€•class analysis of studentsâ€™ attitudes towards research methods and statistics. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 2013, 83, 280-304.	1.6	24
10	In public peer review of submitted manuscripts, how do reviewer comments differ from comments written by interested members of the scientific community? A content analysis of comments written for Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics. Scientometrics, 2012, 93, 915-929.	1.6	15
11	The generalized propensity score methodology for estimating unbiased journal impact factors. Scientometrics, 2012, 92, 377-390.	1.6	13
12	Heterogeneity of Inter-Rater Reliabilities of Grant Peer Reviews and Its Determinants: A General Estimating Equations Approach. PLoS ONE, 2012, 7, e48509.	1.1	44
13	Seasonal bias in editorial decisions? A study using data from chemistry. Learned Publishing, 2011, 24, 325-328.	0.8	4
14	Does the h index for assessing single publications really work? A case study on papers published in chemistry. Scientometrics, 2011, 89, 835-843.	1.6	11
15	Is interactive open access publishing able to identify high-impact submissions? A study on the predictive validity of Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics by using percentile rank classes. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2011, 62, 61-71.	2.6	27
16	A content analysis of refereesâ€™ comments: how do comments on manuscripts rejected by a high-impact journal and later published in either a low- or high-impact journal differ?. Scientometrics, 2010, 83, 493-506.	1.6	35
17	The manuscript reviewing process: Empirical research on review requests, review sequences, and decision rules in peer review. Library and Information Science Research, 2010, 32, 5-12.	1.2	40
18	A Reliability-Generalization Study of Journal Peer Reviews: A Multilevel Meta-Analysis of Inter-Rater Reliability and Its Determinants. PLoS ONE, 2010, 5, e14331.	1.1	130

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Do we need the h index and its variants in addition to standard bibliometric measures?. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2009, 60, 1286-1289.	2.6	29
20	Universality of citation distributions—A validation of Radicchi et al.'s relative indicator $c_f = c/c_0$ at the micro level using data from chemistry. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2009, 60, 1664-1670.	2.6	35
21	Convergent validity of bibliometric Google Scholar data in the field of chemistry—Citation counts for papers that were accepted by Angewandte Chemie International Edition or rejected but published elsewhere, using Google Scholar, Science Citation Index, Scopus, and Chemical Abstracts. Journal of Informetrics, 2009, 3, 27-35.	1.4	76
22	A new reference standard for citation analysis in chemistry and related fields based on the sections of Chemical Abstracts. Scientometrics, 2009, 78, 219-229.	1.6	43
23	The influence of the applicants' gender on the modeling of a peer review process by using latent Markov models. Scientometrics, 2009, 81, 407-411.	1.6	10
24	The state of h index research. EMBO Reports, 2009, 10, 2-6.	2.0	310
25	The publication and citation impact profiles of *Angewandte Chemie* and the *Journal of the American Chemical Society* based on the sections of *Chemical Abstracts:* A case study on the limitations of the Journal Impact Factor. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2009, 60, 176-183.	2.6	18
26	Are there better indices for evaluation purposes than the **h** index? A comparison of nine different variants of the **h** index using data from biomedicine. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2008, 59, 830-837.	2.6	357
27	Selecting manuscripts for a high-impact journal through peer review: A citation analysis of communications that were accepted by *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, or rejected but published elsewhere. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2008, 59, 1841-1852.	2.6	64
28	The Effectiveness of the Peer Review Process: Inter-Referee Agreement and Predictive Validity of Manuscript Refereeing at *Angewandte Chemie*. Angewandte Chemie - International Edition, 2008, 47, 7173-7178.	7.2	53
29	Multiple publication on a single research study: Does it pay? The influence of number of research articles on total citation counts in biomedicine. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2007, 58, 1100-1107.	2.6	61
30	What do we know about the h index?. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2007, 58, 1381-1385.	2.6	445
31	Row-column (RC) association model applied to grant peer review. Scientometrics, 2007, 73, 139-147.	1.6	7
32	Using scripts to streamline citation analysis on STN International. Scientometrics, 2007, 71, 145-150.	1.6	2
33	Gatekeepers of science—Effects of external reviewers' attributes on the assessments of fellowship applications. Journal of Informetrics, 2007, 1, 83-91.	1.4	23
34	Entwicklung eines Hochschul-Rankingverfahrens mittels Mixed-Rasch-Modell und Mehrebenenanalyse am Beispiel der Psychologie. Diagnostica, 2007, 53, 3-16.	1.0	13
35	Selecting scientific excellence through committee peer review - A citation analysis of publications previously published to approval or rejection of post-doctoral research fellowship applicants. Scientometrics, 2006, 68, 427-440.	1.6	98
36	Publications as a measure of scientific advancement and of scientists' productivity. Learned Publishing, 2005, 18, 143-148.	0.8	41

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Does the h-index for ranking of scientists really work?. Scientometrics, 2005, 65, 391-392.	1.6	302
38	Study Costs, Student Income and Public Policy in Europe. European Journal of Education, 1999, 34, 7-21.	1.7	16
39	An Evaluation of the Peer Review Process atAngewandte Chemie. Angewandte Chemie International Edition in English, 1993, 32, 234-238.	4.4	18
40	Reply:. Angewandte Chemie International Edition in English, 1993, 32, 1030-1031.	4.4	2
41	Evaluation des Peerâ€Reviewâ€Verfahrens bei der <i>Angewandten Chemie</i>**. Angewandte Chemie, 1993, 105, 247-251.	1.6	13
42	Concerning â€œAn Evaluation of the Peer Review Process at <i>Angewandte Chemie</i>â€. Angewandte Chemie, 1993, 105, 1079-1079.	1.6	4
43	Four types of research in the humanities: Setting the stage for research quality criteria in the humanities. Research Evaluation, 0, , .	1.3	17
44	Types of research output profiles: A multilevel latent class analysis of the Austrian Science Fund's final project report data. Research Evaluation, 0, , .	1.3	8