Giovanni Abramo

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/7530880/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

138	4,516	101384	138251
papers	citations	36 h-index	58 g-index

139	139	139	2715
all docs	docs citations	times ranked	citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	Research collaboration and productivity: is there correlation?. Higher Education, 2009, 57, 155-171.	2.8	252
2	How do you define and measure research productivity?. Scientometrics, 2014, 101, 1129-1144.	1.6	164
3	The relationship between scientistsâ€™ research performance and the degree of internationalization of their research. Scientometrics, 2011, 86, 629-643.	1.6	158
4	Gender differences in research productivity: A bibliometric analysis of the Italian academic system. Scientometrics, 2009, 79, 517-539.	1.6	151
5	Gender differences in research collaboration. Journal of Informetrics, 2013, 7, 811-822.	1.4	151
6	Evaluating research: from informed peer review to bibliometrics. Scientometrics, 2011, 87, 499-514.	1.6	144
7	Universityâ€“industry collaboration in Italy: A bibliometric examination. Technovation, 2009, 29, 498-507.	4.2	140
8	A heuristic approach to author name disambiguation in bibliometrics databases for large-scale research assessments. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2011, 62, 257-269.	2.6	133
9	Allocative efficiency in public research funding: Can bibliometrics help?. Research Policy, 2009, 38, 206-215.	3.3	128
10	The relationship among research productivity, research collaboration, and their determinants. Journal of Informetrics, 2017, 11, 1016-1030.	1.4	93
11	The measurement of Italian universitiesâ€™ research productivity by a non parametric-bibliometric methodology. Scientometrics, 2008, 76, 225-244.	1.6	84
12	Assessing the varying level of impact measurement accuracy as a function of the citation window length. Journal of Informetrics, 2011, 5, 659-667.	1.4	83
13	Predicting publication long-term impact through a combination of early citations and journal impact factor. Journal of Informetrics, 2019, 13, 32-49.	1.4	77
14	Research productivity: Are higher academic ranks more productive than lower ones?. Scientometrics, 2011, 88, 915-928.	1.6	70
15	A field-standardized application of DEA to national-scale research assessment of universities. Journal of Informetrics, 2011, 5, 618-628.	1.4	68
16	The relationship between the number of authors of a publication, its citations and the impact factor of the publishing journal: Evidence from Italy. Journal of Informetrics, 2015, 9, 746-761.	1.4	66
17	National-scale research performance assessment at the individual level. Scientometrics, 2011, 86, 347-364.	1.6	65
18	National research assessment exercises: a comparison of peer review and bibliometrics rankings. Scientometrics, 2011, 89, 929-941.	1.6	65

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	A farewell to the MNCS and like size-independent indicators. Journal of Informetrics, 2016, 10, 646-651.	1.4	63
20	University-industry research collaboration: a model to assess university capability. Higher Education, 2011, 62, 163-181.	2.8	62
21	The importance of accounting for the number of co-authors and their order when assessing research performance at the individual level in the life sciences. Journal of Informetrics, 2013, 7, 198-208.	1.4	61
22	Revisiting the scaling of citations for research assessment. Journal of Informetrics, 2012, 6, 470-479.	1.4	59
23	Assessment of sectoral aggregation distortion in research productivity measurements. Research Evaluation, 2008, 17, 111-121.	1.3	56
24	The contribution of star scientists to overall sex differences in research productivity. Scientometrics, 2009, 81, 137-156.	1.6	54
25	Citations versus journal impact factor as proxy of quality: could the latter ever be preferable?. Scientometrics, 2010, 84, 821-833.	1.6	54
26	The collaboration behavior of top scientists. Scientometrics, 2019, 118, 215-232.	1.6	53
27	What is the appropriate length of the publication period over which to assess research performance?. Scientometrics, 2012, 93, 1005-1017.	1.6	51
28	A comparison of two approaches for measuring interdisciplinary research output: The disciplinary diversity of authors vs the disciplinary diversity of the reference list. Journal of Informetrics, 2018, 12, 1182-1193.	1.4	51
29	Revisiting the scientometric conceptualization of impact and its measurement. Journal of Informetrics, 2018, 12, 590-597.	1.4	47
30	Individual research performance: A proposal for comparing apples to oranges. Journal of Informetrics, 2013, 7, 528-539.	1.4	46
31	Are the authors of highly cited articles also the most productive ones?. Journal of Informetrics, 2014, 8, 89-97.	1.4	46
32	Identifying interdisciplinarity through the disciplinary classification of coauthors of scientific publications. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2012, 63, 2206-2222.	2.6	44
33	Career advancement and scientific performance in universities. Scientometrics, 2014, 98, 891-907.	1.6	43
34	The combined effects of age and seniority on research performance of full professors. Science and Public Policy, 2016, 43, 301-319.	1.2	43
35	The role of information asymmetry in the market for universityâ€“industry research collaboration. Journal of Technology Transfer, 2011, 36, 84-100.	2.5	42
36	The field-standardized average impact of national research systems compared to world average: the case of Italy. Scientometrics, 2011, 88, 599-615.	1.6	42

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	The impact of unproductive and top researchers on overall university research performance. Journal of Informetrics, 2013, 7, 166-175.	1.4	40
38	The dangers of performance-based research funding in non-competitive higher education systems. Scientometrics, 2011, 87, 641-654.	1.6	38
39	Revisiting size effects in higher education research productivity. Higher Education, 2012, 63, 701-717.	2.8	38
40	An individualâ€level assessment of the relationship between spinâ€off activities and research performance in universities. R and D Management, 2012, 42, 225-242.	3.0	37
41	The collaboration behaviors of scientists in Italy: A field level analysis. Journal of Informetrics, 2013, 7, 442-454.	1.4	36
42	Do interdisciplinary research teams deliver higher gains to science?. Scientometrics, 2017, 111, 317-336.	1.6	36
43	The <scp>VQR</scp>, <scp>I</scp>taly's second national research assessment: Methodological failures and ranking distortions. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 2202-2214.	1.5	35
44	Are researchers that collaborate more at the international level top performers? An investigation on the Italian university system. Journal of Informetrics, 2011, 5, 204-213.	1.4	34
45	The dispersion of research performance within and between universities as a potential indicator of the competitive intensity in higher education systems. Journal of Informetrics, 2012, 6, 155-168.	1.4	33
46	Variation in research collaboration patterns across academic ranks. Scientometrics, 2014, 98, 2275-2294.	1.6	33
47	Gender differences in research performance within and between countries: Italy vs Norway. Journal of Informetrics, 2021, 15, 101144.	1.4	32
48	Should the research performance of scientists be distinguished by gender?. Journal of Informetrics, 2015, 9, 25-38.	1.4	31
49	A gender analysis of top scientistsâ€™ collaboration behavior: evidence from Italy. Scientometrics, 2019, 120, 405-418.	1.6	31
50	The effect of multidisciplinary collaborations on research diversification. Scientometrics, 2018, 116, 423-433.	1.6	30
51	A bibliometric tool to assess the regional dimension of universityâ€“industry research collaborations. Scientometrics, 2012, 91, 955-975.	1.6	29
52	Refrain from adopting the combination of citation and journal metrics to grade publications, as used in the Italian national research assessment exercise (VQR 2011â€“2014). Scientometrics, 2016, 109, 2053-2065.	1.6	28
53	Testing the tradeâ€off between productivity and quality in research activities. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2010, 61, 132-140.	2.6	27
54	The effects of gender, age and academic rank on research diversification. Scientometrics, 2018, 114, 373-387.	1.6	27

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	The role of geographical proximity in knowledge diffusion, measured by citations to scientific literature. Journal of Informetrics, 2020, 14, 101010.	1.4	26
56	National peer-review research assessment exercises for the hard sciences can be a complete waste of money: the Italian case. Scientometrics, 2013, 95, 311-324.	1.6	24
57	Gender bias in academic recruitment. Scientometrics, 2016, 106, 119-141.	1.6	24
58	Impact of Covid-19 on research output by gender across countries. Scientometrics, 2022, 127, 6811-6826.	1.6	24
59	Assessing publicâ€“private research collaboration: is it possible to compare university performance?. Scientometrics, 2010, 84, 173-197.	1.6	23
60	Measuring institutional research productivity for the life sciences: the importance of accounting for the order of authors in the byline. Scientometrics, 2013, 97, 779-795.	1.6	23
61	Peer review versus bibliometrics: Which method better predicts the scholarly impact of publications?. Scientometrics, 2019, 121, 537-554.	1.6	23
62	A sensitivity analysis of researchersâ€™ productivity rankings to the time of citation observation. Journal of Informetrics, 2012, 6, 192-201.	1.4	22
63	Evaluating university research: Same performance indicator, different rankings. Journal of Informetrics, 2015, 9, 514-525.	1.4	22
64	An assessment of the first â€œscientific habilitationâ€•for university appointments in Italy. Economia Politica, 2015, 32, 329-357.	1.2	21
65	The northâ€“south divide in the Italian higher education system. Scientometrics, 2016, 109, 2093-2117.	1.6	21
66	Ranking research institutions by the number of highly-cited articles per scientist. Journal of Informetrics, 2015, 9, 915-923.	1.4	19
67	A farewell to the MNCS and like size-independent indicators: Rejoinder. Journal of Informetrics, 2016, 10, 679-683.	1.4	19
68	Comparison of research performance of Italian and Norwegian professors and universities. Journal of Informetrics, 2020, 14, 101023.	1.4	19
69	The suitability of h and g indexes for measuring the research performance of institutions. Scientometrics, 2013, 97, 555-570.	1.6	17
70	Assessing national strengths and weaknesses in research fields. Journal of Informetrics, 2014, 8, 766-775.	1.4	17
71	Relatives in the same university faculty: nepotism or merit?. Scientometrics, 2014, 101, 737-749.	1.6	17
72	Inefficiency in selecting products for submission to national research assessment exercises. Scientometrics, 2014, 98, 2069-2086.	1.6	16

#	Article	IF	Citations
73	The effect of a countryâ€™s name in the title of a publication on its visibility and citability. Scientometrics, 2016, 109, 1895-1909.	1.6	16
74	Does your surname affect the citability of your publications?. Journal of Informetrics, 2017, 11, 121-127.	1.4	16
75	National research assessment exercises: the effects of changing the rules of the game during the game. Scientometrics, 2011, 88, 229-238.	1.6	15
76	A national-scale cross-time analysis of university research performance. Scientometrics, 2011, 87, 399-413.	1.6	14
77	How important is choice of the scaling factor in standardizing citations?. Journal of Informetrics, 2012, 6, 645-654.	1.4	14
78	Assessing the accuracy of the <scp>h</scp>â€•and <scp>g</scp>â€indexes for measuring researchers' productivity. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2013, 64, 1224-1234.	2.6	14
79	Investigating returns to scope of research fields in universities. Higher Education, 2014, 68, 69-85.	2.8	14
80	A multivariate stochastic model to assess research performance. Scientometrics, 2015, 102, 1755-1772.	1.6	14
81	How long do top scientists maintain their stardom? An analysis by region, gender and discipline: evidence from Italy. Scientometrics, 2017, 110, 867-877.	1.6	14
82	When research assessment exercises leave room for opportunistic behavior by the subjects under evaluation. Journal of Informetrics, 2019, 13, 830-840.	1.4	14
83	Are all citations worth the same? Valuing citations by the value of the citing items. Journal of Informetrics, 2019, 13, 500-514.	1.4	14
84	The effects of citation-based research evaluation schemes on self-citation behavior. Journal of Informetrics, 2021, 15, 101204.	1.4	14
85	Selection committees for academic recruitment: does gender matter?. Research Evaluation, 2015, 24, 392-404.	1.3	13
86	An investigation on the skewness patterns and fractal nature of research productivity distributions at field and discipline level. Journal of Informetrics, 2017, 11, 324-335.	1.4	13
87	Diversification versus specialization in scientific research: Which strategy pays off?. Technovation, 2019, 82-83, 51-57.	4.2	13
88	A new bibliometric approach to assess the scientific specialization of regions. Research Evaluation, 2014, 23, 183-194.	1.3	12
89	The determinants of academic career advancement: Evidence from Italy. Science and Public Policy, 2015, , scu086.	1.2	12
90	Specialization versus diversification in research activities: the extent, intensity and relatedness of field diversification by individual scientists. Scientometrics, 2017, 112, 1403-1418.	1.6	12

#	Article	IF	Citations
91	Mapping Excellence in National Research Systems. Evaluation Review, 2009, 33, 159-188.	0.4	11
92	Assessing technical and cost efficiency of research activities: a case study of the Italian university system. Research Evaluation, 2009, 18, 61-70.	1.3	11
93	National research assessment exercises: a measure of the distortion of performance rankings when labor input is treated as uniform. Scientometrics, 2010, 84, 605-619.	1.6	11
94	On tit for tat: Franceschini and Maisano versus ANVUR regarding the Italian research assessment exercise VQR 2011â€“2014. Journal of Informetrics, 2017, 11, 783-787.	1.4	11
95	A nationâ€™s foreign and domestic professors: which have better research performance? (the Italian) Tj ETQq1 1 0.784314 rgBT /Ove	2.8	11
96	The balance of knowledge flows. Journal of Informetrics, 2019, 13, 1-9.	1.4	11
97	Knowledge spillovers: Does the geographic proximity effect decay over time? A discipline-level analysis, accounting for cognitive proximity, with and without self-citations. Journal of Informetrics, 2020, 14, 101072.	1.4	11
98	The ratio of top scientists to the academic staff as an indicator of the competitive strength of universities. Journal of Informetrics, 2016, 10, 596-605.	1.4	10
99	Who benefits from a countryâ€™s scientific research?. Journal of Informetrics, 2018, 12, 249-258.	1.4	10
100	Does the geographic proximity effect on knowledge spillovers vary across research fields?. Scientometrics, 2020, 123, 1021-1036.	1.6	10
101	Peer review research assessment: a sensitivity analysis of performance rankings to the share of research product evaluated. Scientometrics, 2010, 85, 705-720.	1.6	9
102	A sensitivity analysis of research institutionsâ€™ productivity rankings to the time of citation observation. Journal of Informetrics, 2012, 6, 298-306.	1.4	9
103	Variability of research performance across disciplines within universities in non-competitive higher education systems. Scientometrics, 2014, 98, 777-795.	1.6	9
104	A novel methodology to assess the scientific standing of nations at field level. Journal of Informetrics, 2020, 14, 100986.	1.4	9
105	Revealing the scientific comparative advantage of nations: Common and distinctive features. Journal of Informetrics, 2022, 16, 101244.	1.4	9
106	How the Covid-19 crisis shaped research collaboration behaviour. Scientometrics, 2022, 127, 5053-5071.	1.6	9
107	A new approach to measure the scientific strengths of territories. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2015, 66, 1167-1177.	1.5	8
108	From rankings to funnel plots: The question of accounting for uncertainty when assessing university research performance. Journal of Informetrics, 2016, 10, 854-862.	1.4	8

#	Article	IF	Citations
109	A methodology to measure the effectiveness of academic recruitment and turnover. Journal of Informetrics, 2016, 10, 31-42.	1.4	8
110	The effect of academic mobility on research performance: The case of Italy. Quantitative Science Studies, 2022, 3, 345-362.	1.6	8
111	The alignment of public research supply and industry demand for effective technology transfer: the case of Italy. Science and Public Policy, 2009, 36, 2-14.	1.2	7
112	The spin-off of elite universities in non-competitive, undifferentiated higher education systems: an empirical simulation in Italy. Studies in Higher Education, 2014, 39, 1270-1289.	2.9	7
113	Funnel plots for visualizing uncertainty in the research performance of institutions. Journal of Informetrics, 2015, 9, 954-961.	1.4	7
114	A comparison of university performance scores and ranks by MNCS and FSS. Journal of Informetrics, 2016, 10, 889-901.	1.4	7
115	The scholarly impact of private sector research: A multivariate analysis. Journal of Informetrics, 2021, 15, 101191.	1.4	6
116	The technology transfer of the Italian public research system: the case of the National Research Council of Italy. International Journal of Technology Transfer and Commercialisation, 2006, 5, 338.	0.2	5
117	A methodology to compute the territorial productivity of scientists: The case of Italy. Journal of Informetrics, 2015, 9, 675-685.	1.4	5
118	A robust benchmark for the hâ€•and gâ€‐indexes. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2010, 61, 1275-1280.	2.6	4
119	Were the Italian policy reforms to contrast favoritism and foster effectiveness in faculty recruitment successful?. Science and Public Policy, 2021, 47, 604-615.	1.2	4
120	On the relation between the degree of internationalization of cited and citing publications: A field level analysis, including and excluding self-citations. Journal of Informetrics, 2021, 15, 101101.	1.4	4
121	Bibliometric Evaluation of Research Performance: Where Do We Stand?. Voprosy Obrazovaniya, 2017, , 112-127.	0.4	4
122	A decision support system for public research organizations participating in national research assessment exercises. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2009, 60, 2095-2106.	2.6	3
123	Assessing the relative technology transfer performance of universities and public research laboratories: the case of Italy. International Journal of Technology Transfer and Commercialisation, 2012, 11, 51.	0.2	3
124	The dispersion of the citation distribution of top scientistsâ€™ publications. Scientometrics, 2016, 109, 1711-1724.	1.6	3
125	The domestic localization of knowledge flows as evidenced by publication citation: the case of Italy. Scientometrics, 2020, 125, 1305-1329.	1.6	3
126	The different responses of universities to introduction of performance-based research funding. Research Evaluation, 0, , .	1.3	3

#	Article	IF	Citations
127	Publicâ€“private research collaborations: Longitudinal fieldâ€level analysis of determinants, frequency, and impact. Journal of Economic Surveys, 0, , .	3.7	3
128	Selecting competent referees to assess research projects proposals: A study of referees' registers. Research Evaluation, 2013, 22, 41-51.	1.3	2
129	Authorship analysis of specialized vs diversified research output. Journal of Informetrics, 2019, 13, 564-573.	1.4	2
130	A bibliometric methodology to unveil territorial inequities in the scientific wealth to combat COVID-19. Scientometrics, 2021, 126, 6601-6624.	1.6	2
131	Informed peer review for publication assessments: Are improved impact measures worth the hassle?. Quantitative Science Studies, 2020, 1, 1321-1333.	1.6	2
132	Accounting for Gender Research Performance Differences in Ranking Universities. Current Science, 2015, 109, 1783.	0.4	2
133	Drivers of academic engagement in publicâ€“private research collaboration: an empirical study. Journal of Technology Transfer, 2022, 47, 1861-1884.	2.5	2
134	Scientometricâ€based analysis in business and economics: Introduction, examples, and guidelines. Journal of Economic Surveys, 2021, 35, 1261-1270.	3.7	2
135	The geographic proximity effect on domestic cross-sector vis-Ã-vis intra-sector research collaborations. Scientometrics, 2022, 127, 3505-3521.	1.6	2
136	Response to comments on: â€œDoes your surname affect the citability of your publications?â€• Journal of Informetrics, 2017, 11, 855-858.	1.4	0
137	Accounting for Gender Research Performance Differences in Ranking Universities. Current Science, 2015, 109, 1783.	0.4	0
138	Unveiling the distinctive traits of a nationâ€™s research performance: The case of Italy and Norway. Quantitative Science Studies, 2022, 3, 732-754.	1.6	0