

# Ludo Waltman

## List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/1556506/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

93  
papers

25,684  
citations

53794

45  
h-index

51608

86  
g-index

105  
all docs

105  
docs citations

105  
times ranked

18927  
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Software survey: VOSviewer, a computer program for bibliometric mapping. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2010, 84, 523-538.	3.0	8,777
2	From Louvain to Leiden: guaranteeing well-connected communities. <i>Scientific Reports</i> , 2019, 9, 5233.	3.3	2,249
3	Bibliometrics: The Leiden Manifesto for research metrics. <i>Nature</i> , 2015, 520, 429-431.	27.8	1,465
4	A unified approach to mapping and clustering of bibliometric networks. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2010, 4, 629-635.	2.9	1,238
5	Citation-based clustering of publications using CitNetExplorer and VOSviewer. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2017, 111, 1053-1070.	3.0	1,133
6	Visualizing Bibliometric Networks. , 2014, , 285-320.		1,053
7	A review of the literature on citation impact indicators. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2016, 10, 365-391.	2.9	743
8	A smart local moving algorithm for large-scale modularity-based community detection. <i>European Physical Journal B</i> , 2013, 86, 1.	1.5	738
9	Science of science. <i>Science</i> , 2018, 359, .	12.6	701
10	Constructing bibliometric networks: A comparison between full and fractional counting. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2016, 10, 1178-1195.	2.9	664
11	How to normalize cooccurrence data? An analysis of some well-known similarity measures. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2009, 60, 1635-1651.	2.6	530
12	A comparison of two techniques for bibliometric mapping: Multidimensional scaling and VOS. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2010, 61, 2405-2416.	2.6	496
13	CitNetExplorer: A new software tool for analyzing and visualizing citation networks. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2014, 8, 802-823.	2.9	421
14	A new methodology for constructing a publication-level classification system of science. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2012, 63, 2378-2392.	2.6	391
15	Towards a new crown indicator: Some theoretical considerations. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2011, 5, 37-47.	2.9	290
16	The Leiden ranking 2011/2012: Data collection, indicators, and interpretation. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2012, 63, 2419-2432.	2.6	284
17	Large-scale comparison of bibliographic data sources: Scopus, Web of Science, Dimensions, Crossref, and Microsoft Academic. <i>Quantitative Science Studies</i> , 2021, 2, 20-41.	3.3	252
18	The inconsistency of the h-index. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2012, 63, 406-415.	2.6	244

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	VOS: A New Method for Visualizing Similarities Between Objects. Studies in Classification, Data Analysis, and Knowledge Organization, 2007, , 299-306.	0.2	242
20	Large-scale analysis of the accuracy of the journal classification systems of Web of Science and Scopus. Journal of Informetrics, 2016, 10, 347-364.	2.9	219
21	Automatic term identification for bibliometric mapping. Scientometrics, 2010, 82, 581-596.	3.0	191
22	BIBLIOMETRIC MAPPING OF THE COMPUTATIONAL INTELLIGENCE FIELD. International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems, 2007, 15, 625-645.	1.9	189
23	Citation Analysis May Severely Underestimate the Impact of Clinical Research as Compared to Basic Research. PLoS ONE, 2013, 8, e62395.	2.5	176
24	Towards a new crown indicator: an empirical analysis. Scientometrics, 2011, 87, 467-481.	3.0	175
25	Field-normalized citation impact indicators and the choice of an appropriate counting method. Journal of Informetrics, 2015, 9, 872-894.	2.9	171
26	An empirical analysis of the use of alphabetical authorship in scientific publishing. Journal of Informetrics, 2012, 6, 700-711.	2.9	142
27	Some modifications to the SNIP journal impact indicator. Journal of Informetrics, 2013, 7, 272-285.	2.9	141
28	Generalizing the h- and g-indices. Journal of Informetrics, 2008, 2, 263-271.	2.9	122
29	On the calculation of percentile-based bibliometric indicators. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2013, 64, 372-379.	2.6	111
30	<scp>F</scp>1000 Recommendations as a Potential New Data Source for Research Evaluation: A Comparison With Citations. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2014, 65, 433-445.	2.9	101
31	Source normalized indicators of citation impact: an overview of different approaches and an empirical comparison. Scientometrics, 2013, 96, 699-716.	3.0	96
32	A systematic empirical comparison of different approaches for normalizing citation impact indicators. Journal of Informetrics, 2013, 7, 833-849.	2.9	95
33	Characterizing in-text citations in scientific articles: A large-scale analysis. Journal of Informetrics, 2018, 12, 59-73.	2.9	89
34	Clustering Scientific Publications Based on Citation Relations: A Systematic Comparison of Different Methods. PLoS ONE, 2016, 11, e0154404.	2.5	89
35	Field-normalized citation impact indicators using algorithmically constructed classification systems of science. Journal of Informetrics, 2015, 9, 102-117.	2.9	88
36	Mapping patient safety: a large-scale literature review using bibliometric visualisation techniques. BMJ Open, 2014, 4, e004468.	1.9	86

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Predicting the long-term citation impact of recent publications. Journal of Informetrics, 2015, 9, 642-657.	2.9	85
38	-learning agents in a Cournot oligopoly model. Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 2008, 32, 3275-3293.	1.6	83
39	Rivals for the crown: Reply to Opthof and Leydesdorff. Journal of Informetrics, 2010, 4, 431-435.	2.9	79
40	Globalisation of science in kilometres. Journal of Informetrics, 2011, 5, 574-582.	2.9	69
41	A Large-Scale Analysis of Impact Factor Biased Journal Self-Citations. PLoS ONE, 2016, 11, e0161021.	2.5	63
42	Visualizing the computational intelligence field [Application Notes]. IEEE Computational Intelligence Magazine, 2006, 1, 6-10.	3.2	61
43	The detection of "hot regions" in the geography of science" A visualization approach by using density maps. Journal of Informetrics, 2011, 5, 547-553.	2.9	61
44	Universality of citation distributions revisited. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2012, 63, 72-77.	2.6	61
45	Counting publications and citations: Is more always better?. Journal of Informetrics, 2013, 7, 635-641.	2.9	55
46	A scientometric overview of COVID-19. PLoS ONE, 2021, 16, e0244839.	2.5	51
47	A recursive field-normalized bibliometric performance indicator: an application to the field of library and information science. Scientometrics, 2011, 89, 301-314.	3.0	50
48	Appropriate similarity measures for author co-citation analysis. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2008, 59, 1653-1661.	2.6	47
49	Rethinking impact factors: better ways to judge a journal. Nature, 2019, 569, 621-623.	27.8	46
50	Systematic analysis of agreement between metrics and peer review in the UK REF. Palgrave Communications, 2019, 5, .	4.7	43
51	The relation between Eigenfactor, audience factor, and influence weight. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2010, 61, 1476-1486.	2.6	30
52	PageRank-Related Methods for Analyzing Citation Networks. , 2014, , 83-100.		30
53	A principled methodology for comparing relatedness measures for clustering publications. Quantitative Science Studies, 0, , 1-23.	3.3	30
54	Visualizing the Computational Intelligence Field. IEEE Computational Intelligence Magazine, 2006, 1, 6-10.	3.2	28

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	A large-scale bibliometric analysis of global climate change research between 2001 and 2018. <i>Climatic Change</i> , 2022, 170, 1.	3.6	28
56	The correlation between citation-based and expert-based assessments of publication channels: SNIP and SJR vs. Norwegian quality assessments. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2014, 8, 985-996.	2.9	26
57	Field Normalization of Scientometric Indicators. <i>Springer Handbooks</i> , 2019, , 281-300.	0.6	26
58	Maximum likelihood parameter estimation in probabilistic fuzzy classifiers. , 0, , .		24
59	A multidimensional framework for characterizing the citation impact of scientific publications. <i>Quantitative Science Studies</i> , 2021, 2, 155-183.	3.3	22
60	Investigating disagreement in the scientific literature. <i>ELife</i> , 2021, 10, .	6.0	22
61	Economic modeling using evolutionary algorithms: the effect of a binary encoding of strategies. <i>Journal of Evolutionary Economics</i> , 2011, 21, 737-756.	1.7	21
62	Relations between the shape of a size-frequency distribution and the shape of a rank-frequency distribution. <i>Information Processing and Management</i> , 2011, 47, 238-245.	8.6	20
63	The Closer the Better: Similarity of Publication Pairs at Different Cocitation Levels. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</i> , 2018, 69, 600-609.	2.9	20
64	On the correlation between bibliometric indicators and peer review: reply to Opthof and Leydesdorff. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2011, 88, 1017-1022.	3.0	19
65	Some comments on Egghe's derivation of the impact factor distribution. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2009, 3, 363-366.	2.9	18
66	The elephant in the room: The problem of quantifying productivity in evaluative scientometrics. <i>Journal of Informetrics</i> , 2016, 10, 671-674.	2.9	18
67	Use of the journal impact factor for assessing individual articles: Statistically flawed or not?. <i>F1000Research</i> , 2020, 9, 366.	1.6	17
68	Exploring the Relationship between the Engineering and Physical Sciences and the Health and Life Sciences by Advanced Bibliometric Methods. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2014, 9, e111530.	2.5	17
69	Use of the journal impact factor for assessing individual articles need not be statistically wrong. <i>F1000Research</i> , 2020, 9, 366.	1.6	16
70	Special issue on bibliographic data sources. <i>Quantitative Science Studies</i> , 2020, 1, 360-362.	3.3	15
71	A Novel Algorithm for Visualizing Concept Associations. , 0, , .		14
72	Topic identification challenge. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2017, 111, 1223-1224.	3.0	14

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
73	Some comments on the question whether co-occurrence data should be normalized. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2007, 58, 1701-1703.	2.6	13
74	Conceptual difficulties in the use of statistical inference in citation analysis. Journal of Informetrics, 2016, 10, 1249-1252.	2.9	12
75	Collaborations span 1,553 kilometres. Nature, 2011, 473, 154-154.	27.8	10
76	A Longitudinal Analysis of Publications on Maternal Mortality. Paediatric and Perinatal Epidemiology, 2015, 29, 481-489.	1.7	10
77	Intermediacy of publications. Royal Society Open Science, 2020, 7, 190207.	2.4	9
78	Robust Evolutionary Algorithm Design for Socio-Economic Simulation: Some Comments. Computational Economics, 2009, 33, 103-105.	2.6	8
79	Some Limitations of the HIndex: A Commentary on Ruscio and Colleagues' Analysis of Bibliometric Indices. Measurement, 2012, 10, 172-175.	0.2	8
80	Opening science: The rebirth of a scholarly journal. Quantitative Science Studies, 2020, 1, 1-3.	3.3	6
81	Visualizing the WCCI 2006 Knowledge Domain. , 2006, , .		5
82	Some comments on the journal weighted impact factor proposed by Habibzadeh and Yadollahie. Journal of Informetrics, 2008, 2, 369-372.	2.9	5
83	Algorithmic labeling in hierarchical classifications of publications: Evaluation of bibliographic fields and term weighting approaches. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2021, 72, 853-869.	2.9	5
84	Analyzing the activities of visitors of the Leiden Ranking website. Journal of Data and Information Science, 2018, 3, 81-98.	1.1	5
85	A Theoretical Analysis of Cooperative Behavior in Multi-agent Q-learning. , 2007, , .		4
86	An Evolutionary Model of Price Competition Among Spatially Distributed Firms. Computational Economics, 2013, 42, 373-391.	2.6	2
87	Improving the evaluation of worldwide biomedical research output: classification method and standardised bibliometric indicators by disease. BMJ Open, 2018, 8, e020818.	1.9	2
88	Innovations in peer review in scholarly publishing: a meta-summary. Wellcome Open Research, 0, 7, 82.	1.8	2
89	A mathematical analysis of the long-run behavior of genetic algorithms for social modeling. Soft Computing, 2012, 16, 1071-1089.	3.6	1
90	Is the Nature Index at odds with DORA?. Nature, 2017, 545, 412-412.	27.8	1

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
91	Science of science. Bibliosfera, 2021, , 25-42.	0.3	1
92	Open Abstracts: Where are we?. , 0, , .		1
93	On the proper understanding of the limiting behavior of generalizations of the h- and g-indices. Journal of Informetrics, 2009, 3, 369-370.	2.9	0