

Peter Jacso

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/7855415/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

61
papers

1,861
citations

331259

21
h-index

276539

41
g-index

62
all docs

62
docs citations

62
times ranked

1145
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Google Scholar: the pros and the cons. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2005, 29, 208-214.	2.2	285
2	Google Scholar revisited. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2008, 32, 102-114.	2.2	160
3	Deflated, inflated and phantom citation counts. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2006, 30, 297-309.	2.2	137
4	Metadata mega mess in Google Scholar. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2010, 34, 175-191.	2.2	108
5	Testing the Calculation of a Realistic h-index in Google Scholar, Scopus, and Web of Science for F. W. Lancaster. <i>Library Trends</i> , 2008, 56, 784-815.	0.2	82
6	Calculating the h-index and other bibliometric and scientometric indicators from Google Scholar with the Publish or Perish software. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2009, 33, 1189-1200.	2.2	59
7	The h-index, h-core citation rate and the bibliometric profile of the Scopus database. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2011, 35, 492-501.	2.2	54
8	The plausibility of computing the h-index of scholarly productivity and impact using reference-enhanced databases. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2008, 32, 266-283.	2.2	53
9	The h-index for countries in Web of Science and Scopus. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2009, 33, 831-837.	2.2	53
10	Comparison of journal impact rankings in the <i>SCImago Journal & Country Rank</i> and the <i>Journal Citation Reports</i> databases. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2010, 34, 642-657.	2.2	53
11	A Deficiency in the Algorithm for Calculating the Impact Factor of Scholarly Journals: The Journal Impact Factor. <i>Cortex</i> , 2001, 37, 590-594.	1.1	52
12	The pros and cons of computing the h-index using Web of Science. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2008, 32, 673-688.	2.2	52
13	Google Scholar Metrics for Publications. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2012, 36, 604-619.	2.2	51
14	The pros and cons of computing the h-index using Scopus. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2008, 32, 524-535.	2.2	50
15	Five-year impact factor data in the <i>Journal Citation Reports</i> . <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2009, 33, 603-614.	2.2	44
16	Dubious hit counts and cuckoo's eggs. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2006, 30, 188-193.	2.2	43
17	Errors of omission and their implications for computing scientometric measures in evaluating the publishing productivity and impact of countries. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2009, 33, 376-385.	2.2	37
18	Using Google Scholar for journal impact factors and the h-index in nationwide publishing assessments in academia – siren songs and air-raids. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2012, 36, 462-478.	2.2	32

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Google Scholar Author Citation Tracker: is it too little, too late?. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2012, 36, 126-141.	2.2	31
20	Google Scholar duped and deduped – the aura of ‘‘robometrics’’, <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2011, 35, 154-160.	2.2	27
21	Pragmatic issues in calculating and comparing the quantity and quality of research through rating and ranking of researchers based on peer reviews and bibliometric indicators from Web of Science, Scopus and Google Scholar. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2010, 34, 972-982.	2.2	26
22	The pros and cons of Microsoft Academic Search from a bibliometric perspective. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2011, 35, 983-997.	2.2	26
23	Grim tales about the impact factor and the h-index in the Web of Science and the Journal Citation Reports databases: reflections on Vanclay’s criticism. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2012, 92, 325-354.	1.6	24
24	Eigenfactor and article influence scores in the <i>Journal Citation Reports</i> . <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2010, 34, 339-348.	2.2	23
25	Analyzing the journal coverage of abstracting/indexing databases at variable aggregate and analytic levels. <i>Library and Information Science Research</i> , 1998, 20, 133-151.	1.2	22
26	Database source coverage: hypes, vital signs and reality checks. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2009, 33, 997-1007.	2.2	21
27	The h-index, h-core citation rate and the bibliometric profile of the Web of Science database in three configurations. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2011, 35, 821-833.	2.2	20
28	Differences in the rank position of journals by Eigenfactor metrics and the five-year impact factor in the <i>Journal Citation Reports</i> and the Eigenfactor Project web site. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2010, 34, 496-508.	2.2	18
29	Comparison and Analysis of the Citedness Scores in Web of Science and Google Scholar. <i>Lecture Notes in Computer Science</i> , 2005, , 360-369.	1.0	18
30	Visualizing overlap and rank differences among web-wide search engines. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2005, 29, 554-560.	2.2	14
31	Citation-enhanced indexing/abstracting databases. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2004, 28, 235-238.	2.2	12
32	Citation searching. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2004, 28, 454-460.	2.2	11
33	Open access to scholarly full-text documents. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2006, 30, 587-594.	2.2	11
34	Software issues related to cited references. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2007, 31, 892-905.	2.2	11
35	How big is a database versus how is a database big. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2007, 31, 533-536.	2.2	10
36	The dimensions of cited reference enhanced database subsets. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2007, 31, 694-705.	2.2	10

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Interpretations and misinterpretations of scientometric data in the report of the Royal Society about the scientific landscape in 2011. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2011, 35, 669-682.	2.2	10
38	The problems with the subject categories schema in the EigenFactor database from the perspective of ranking journals by their prestige and impact. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2012, 36, 758-766.	2.2	10
39	Relevance in the eye of the search software. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2005, 29, 676-682.	2.2	8
40	Traditional scholarly publishers and Web 2.0: the case of Springer. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2011, 35, 301-315.	2.2	8
41	Link-enabled cited references. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2004, 28, 306-311.	2.2	7
42	Browsing indexes of cited references. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2005, 29, 107-112.	2.2	7
43	The scientometric portrait of Eugene Garfield through the free ResearcherID service from the Web of Science Core Collection of 67 million master records and 1.3 billion references. <i>Scientometrics</i> , 2018, 114, 545-555.	1.6	7
44	Citedness scores for filtering information and ranking search results. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2004, 28, 371-376.	2.2	6
45	Open access to scholarly indexing/abstracting information. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2006, 30, 461-468.	2.2	6
46	How many web-wide search engines do we need?. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2008, 32, 860-865.	2.2	6
47	Analysis of the Ulrich's Serials Analysis System from the perspective of journal coverage by academic databases. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2012, 36, 307-319.	2.2	6
48	Clustering search results. Part II: search engines for highly structured databases. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2007, 31, 234-241.	2.2	5
49	Clustering search results. Part I: web-wide search engines. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2007, 31, 85-91.	2.2	5
50	The JISC Academic Database Assessment Tool – virtues and vices. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2010, 34, 806-814.	2.2	5
51	Natural language searching. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2004, 28, 75-79.	2.2	4
52	Pertinence in the eye of the user. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2006, 30, 70-76.	2.2	3
53	Open access ready reference suites. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2006, 30, 737-743.	2.2	3
54	The volume of full-text coverage of top-tier marketing journals in the ABI/INFORM and Business Source Premier databases – key indicators for database licensing. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 2013, 37, 132-145.	2.2	3

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	The need for end-user customization of the journal-sets of the subject categories in the <i>SCImago Journal Ranking database</i> for more appropriate league lists. A case study for the Library & Information Science field. Profesional De La Informacion, 2013, 22, 459-473.	2.7	3
56	Query refinement by word proximity and position. Online Information Review, 2004, 28, 158-161.	2.2	2
57	Options for presenting search results. Online Information Review, 2005, 29, 311-319.	2.2	2
58	Clustering search results. Part III: the synergy of metasearching and clustering. Online Information Review, 2007, 31, 376-382.	2.2	2
59	Full text coverage of marketing journals in databases. Online Information Review, 2012, 36, 919-929.	2.2	2
60	Options for presenting search results. Online Information Review, 2005, 29, 412-418.	2.2	1
61	ProQuest's Graduate Education Program (GEP) â€“ a powerful, free database and software package for LIS educators and students worldwide. Online Information Review, 2013, 37, 326-338.	2.2	0