Lifting the crowncitation z-score

DOI: 10.1016/j.joi.2006.09.007
Journal of Informetrics, 2007, 1, 145-154.

#	Paper	IF	Citations
190	Anaesthetic research in the United Kingdom: publishing or perishing?. **2008**, 63, 225-7		18
189	Universality of citation distributions: toward an objective measure of scientific impact. **2008**, 105, 17268-72		498
188	Measuring the validity of early health technology assessment: bibliometrics as a tool to indicate its scientific basis. **2008**, 24, 70-5		4
187	Libcitations: A measure for comparative assessment of book publications in the humanities and social sciences. **2009**, 60, 1083-1096		73
186	Universality of citation distributions: A validation of Radicchi et al.'s relative indicator cf = c/c0 at the micro level using data from chemistry. **2009**, 60, 1664-1670		33
185	Scientometric analysis of national university research performance in analytical chemistry on the basis of academic publications: Italy as case study. **2010**, 398, 17-26		5
184	The iceberg hypothesis revisited. *Scientometrics*, **2010**, 85, 443-461	3	16
183	Scopus's source normalized impact per paper (SNIP) versus a journal impact factor based on fractional counting of citations. **2010**, 61, 2365-2369		100
182	Rivals for the crown: Reply to Opthof and Leydesdorff. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2010**, 4, 431-435	3.1	70
181	Normalization at the field level: Fractional counting of citations. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2010**, 4, 644-646	3.1	72
180	What lies behind the averages and significance of citation indicators in different disciplines?. **2010**, 36, 371-382		37
179	Bibliometric indicators: quality measurements of scientific publication. **2010**, 255, 342-51		275
178	A field-standardized application of DEA to national-scale research assessment of universities. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2011**, 5, 618-628	3.1	52
177	University Rankings. **2011**,		103
176	A combined bibliometric indicator to predict article impact. **2011**, 47, 300-308		54
175	A made-to-measure indicator for cross-disciplinary bibliometric ranking of researchers performance. *Scientometrics*, **2011**, 86, 113-123	3	14
174	A national-scale cross-time analysis of university research performance. *Scientometrics*, **2011**, 87, 399-413	3	13

173	Towards a new crown indicator: an empirical analysis. *Scientometrics*, **2011**, 87, 467-481	3	152
172	The dangers of performance-based research funding in non-competitive higher education systems. *Scientometrics*, **2011**, 87, 641-654	3	34
171	Price revisited: on the growth of dissertations in eight research fields. *Scientometrics*, **2011**, 88, 371-383	3	30
170	A recursive field-normalized bibliometric performance indicator: an application to the field of library and information science. *Scientometrics*, **2011**, 89, 301-314	3	44
169	National research assessment exercises: a comparison of peer review and bibliometrics rankings. *Scientometrics*, **2011**, 89, 929-941	3	52
168	Towards a new crown indicator: Some theoretical considerations. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2011**, 5, 37-47	3.1	249
167	The effects and their stability of field normalization baseline on relative performance with respect to citation impact: A case study of 20 natural science departments. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2011**, 5, 101-113	3.1	24
166	There are neither “king” nor “crown” in scientometrics: Comments on a supposed “alternative” method of normalization. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2011**, 5, 226-227	3.1	39
165	Averages of ratios vs. ratios of averages: An empirical analysis of four levels of aggregation. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2011**, 5, 392-399	3.1	32
164	Are female researchers less cited? A large-scale study of Norwegian scientists. **2011**, 62, 628-636		79
163	How to evaluate universities in terms of their relative citation impacts: Fractional counting of citations and the normalization of differences among disciplines. **2011**, 62, 1146-1155		54
162	Turning the tables on citation analysis one more time: Principles for comparing sets of documents. **2011**, 62, 1370-1381		121
161	The citation life cycle of articles published in 13 American Psychological Association journals: A 25-year longitudinal analysis. **2011**, 62, 1629-1636		16
160	Integrated impact indicators compared with impact factors: An alternative research design with policy implications. **2011**, 62, 2133-2146		102
159	Fractional counting of citations in research evaluation: A cross- and interdisciplinary assessment of the Tsinghua University in Beijing. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2011**, 5, 360-368	3.1	26
158	Chapter 5. Journal Citations. **2012**, 223-300		
157	Testing the fairness of citation indicators for comparison across scientific domains: The case of fractional citation counts. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2012**, 6, 121-130	3.1	63
156	Universality of performance indicators based on citation and reference counts. *Scientometrics*, **2012**, 93, 473-495	3	33

155	What is the appropriate length of the publication period over which to assess research performance?. *Scientometrics*, **2012**, 93, 1005-1017	3	46
154	The weakening relationship between the impact factor and papers' citations in the digital age. **2012**, 63, 2140-2145		142
153	How important is choice of the scaling factor in standardizing citations?. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2012**, 6, 645-654	3.1	13
152	The citation-based indicator and combined impact indicator: New options for measuring impact. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2012**, 6, 631-638	3.1	7
151	An Integrated Impact Indicator: A new definition of 'Impact' with policy relevance. **2012**, 21, 183-188		14
150	Field normalized citation rates, field normalized journal impact and Norwegian weights for allocation of university research funds. *Scientometrics*, **2012**, 92, 767-780	3	27
149	A further step forward in measuring journals' scientific prestige: The SJR2 indicator. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2012**, 6, 674-688	3.1	177
148	Ranking national research systems by citation indicators. A comparative analysis using whole and fractionalised counting methods. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2012**, 6, 36-43	3.1	78
147	Partition-based Field Normalization: An approach to highly specialized publication records. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2012**, 6, 1-10	3.1	13
146	A sensitivity analysis of research institutions' productivity rankings to the time of citation observation. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2012**, 6, 298-306	3.1	7
145	The new Excellence Indicator in the World Report of the SCImago Institutions Rankings 2011. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2012**, 6, 333-335	3.1	107
144	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	3.1	31
143	A sensitivity analysis of researchers' productivity rankings to the time of citation observation. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2012**, 6, 192-201	3.1	15
142	The case of scientometricians with the "absolute relative" impact indicator. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2012**, 6, 254-264	3.1	28
141	Sub-field normalization in the multiplicative case: Average-based citation indicators. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2012**, 6, 543-556	3.1	16
140	Revisiting the scaling of citations for research assessment. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2012**, 6, 470-479	3.1	51
139	The journal impact factor: angel, devil, or scapegoat? A comment on J.K. Vanclay's article 2011. *Scientometrics*, **2012**, 92, 485-503	3	45
138	Citation measures at the micro level: Influence of publication age, field, and uncitedness. **2012**, 63, 1459-1465	4	

137	Sub-field normalization in the multiplicative case: High- and low-impact citation indicators. **2012**, 21, 113-125		12
136	Revisiting size effects in higher education research productivity. **2012**, 63, 701-717		35
135	The quality-quantity-quasity and energy-exergy-entropy exegesis of expected value calculation of citation performance. *Scientometrics*, **2012**, 91, 269-275	3	7
134	Alternatives to the journal impact factor: I3 and the top-10% (or top-25%?) of the most-highly cited papers. *Scientometrics*, **2012**, 92, 355-365	3	57
133	Indicators for research performance evaluation: an overview. **2012**, 109, 321-4		18
132	Reflections on the activity index and related indicators. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2012**, 6, 413-421	3.1	22
131	An individual-level assessment of the relationship between spin-off activities and research performance in universities. **2012**, 42, 225-242		32
130	Universality of citation distributions revisited. **2012**, 63, 72-77		53
129	The inconsistency of the h-index. **2012**, 63, 406-415		182
128	Basic properties of both percentile rank scores and the I3 indicator. **2012**, 63, 416-420		39
127	Cross-field evaluation of publications of research institutes using their contributions to the fields MVPs determined by h-index. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2013**, 7, 455-468	3.1	3
126	A systematic empirical comparison of different approaches for normalizing citation impact indicators. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2013**, 7, 833-849	3.1	83
125	The suitability of h and g indexes for measuring the research performance of institutions. *Scientometrics*, **2013**, 97, 555-570	3	13
124	Universality of scholarly impact metrics. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2013**, 7, 924-932	3.1	63
123	Are mobile researchers more productive and cited than non-mobile researchers? A large-scale study of Norwegian scientists. **2013**, 22, 215-223		34
122	Identifying excellent researchers: A new approach. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2013**, 7, 803-810	3.1	1
121	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	3.1	50
120	Source normalized indicators of citation impact: an overview of different approaches and an empirical comparison. *Scientometrics*, **2013**, 96, 699-716	3	81

119	The impact of unproductive and top researchers on overall university research performance. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2013**, 7, 166-175	3.1	31
118	An evaluation of impacts in "Nanoscience & nanotechnology": steps towards standards for citation analysis. *Scientometrics*, **2013**, 94, 35-55	3	12
117	Selecting competent referees to assess research projects proposals: A study of referees' registers. **2013**, 22, 41-51		2
116	Quantifying the benefits of international scientific collaboration. **2013**, 64, 392-404		60
115	Which percentile-based approach should be preferred for calculating normalized citation impact values? An empirical comparison of five approaches including a newly developed citation-rank approach (P100). *Journal of Informetrics*, **2013**, 7, 933-944	3.1	37
114	Caveats for using statistical significance tests in research assessments. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2013**, 7, 50-62	3.1	41
113	Evaluating a department research: Testing the Leiden methodology in business and management. **2013**, 49, 587-595		9
112	Assessing the accuracy of the h- and g-indexes for measuring researchers' productivity. **2013**, 64, 1224-1234		13
111	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	3	22
110	Comparative rank assessment of journal articles. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2013**, 7, 712-717	3.1	8
109	Does the specification of uncertainty hurt the progress of scientometrics?. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2013**, 7, 292-293	3.1	2
108	Aggregating productivity indices for ranking researchers across multiple areas. **2013**,		20
107	Variability of citation behavior between scientific fields and the normalization problem: The citing-side normalization in context. **2013**, 7, 55-67		5
106	The Scientific Influence of Nations: Quantity, Focus and Impact in Nanotechnology Research. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, **2013**,	1	
105	Coverage, field specialisation and the impact of scientific publishers indexed in the Book Citation Index. **2014**, 38, 24-42		38
104	Distributions of citations of papers of individual authors publishing in different scientific disciplines: Application of Langmuir-type function. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2014**, 8, 972-984	3.1	2
103	Investigating returns to scope of research fields in universities. **2014**, 68, 69-85		11
102	Relationship between downloads and citations at journal and paper levels, and the influence of language. *Scientometrics*, **2014**, 101, 1043-1065	3	30

101	International and domestic co-publishing and their citation impact in different disciplines. *Scientometrics*, **2014**, 98, 823-839	3	68
100	Measuring Scholarly Impact. **2014**,		60
99	A review of the characteristics of 108 author-level bibliometric indicators. *Scientometrics*, **2014**, 101, 125-158	3	124
98	Comparing scientific performance among equals. *Scientometrics*, **2014**, 101, 1731-1745	3	10
97	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	2.6	6
96	Relatives in the same university faculty: nepotism or merit?. *Scientometrics*, **2014**, 101, 737-749	3	10
95	Comparison of the effect of mean-based method and z-score for field normalization of citations at the level of Web of Science subject categories. *Scientometrics*, **2014**, 101, 1679-1693	3	28
94	On the meaningful and non-meaningful use of reference sets in bibliometrics. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2014**, 8, 273-275	3.1	4
93	Sub-field normalization of the IEEE scientific journals based on their connection with Technical Societies. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2014**, 8, 508-533	3.1	12
92	Evaluating the performance of electromagnetic fields (EMF) research work (2003–2013). *Scientometrics*, **2015**, 105, 261-278	3	5
91	Is It a Home Run? Measuring Relative Citation Rates in Accounting Research. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, **2015**,	1	
90	Les Dérives de l'évaluation de la Recherche: du bon usage de la bibliométrie (The Excesses of Research Evaluation: The Proper Use of Bibliometrics) by Yves Gingras. Paris: Raisons d'Agir Editions, 2014. 122 pp. 8? (paper). (ISBN: 978-2-912107-75-6). *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, **2015**, 66, 2171-2176	2.7	3
89	Completing h. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2015**, 9, 385-397	3.1	17
88	A novel approach to citation normalization: A similarity-based method for creating reference sets. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, **2015**, 66, 489-500	2.7	13
87	Improving the normalization effect of mean-based method from the perspective of optimization: optimization-based linear methods and their performance. *Scientometrics*, **2015**, 102, 587-607	3	0
86	Geometric journal impact factors correcting for individual highly cited articles. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2015**, 9, 263-272	3.1	42
85	A review of theory and practice in scientometrics. *European Journal of Operational Research*, **2015**, 246, 1-19	5.6	313
84	Field-normalized citation impact indicators and the choice of an appropriate counting method. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2015**, 9, 872-894	3.1	127

83	Bibliometric indicators of young authors in astrophysics: Can later stars be predicted?. *Scientometrics*, **2015**, 102, 1413-1434	3	14
82	An approach to the author citation potential: measures of scientific performance which are invariant across scientific fields. *Scientometrics*, **2015**, 102, 1467-1496	3	5
81	Inciting the metric oriented humanist: Teaching bibliometrics in a faculty of humanities. *Education for Information*, **2016**, 32, 149-164	0.5	7
80	BIBLIOGRAPHY. **2016**, 407-484		
79	The scientometrics of successful women in science. **2016**,		2
78	A farewell to the MNCS and like size-independent indicators. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2016**, 10, 646-651	3.1	51
77	Research diversification and impact: the case of national nanoscience development. *Scientometrics*, **2016**, 109, 629-659	3	3
76	Two citation-based indicators to measure latent referential value of papers. *Scientometrics*, **2016**, 108, 1299-1313	3	4
75	Expected number of citations and the crown indicator. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2016**, 10, 43-47	3.1	13
74	An index for SSRN downloads. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2016**, 10, 9-28	3.1	1
73	A review of the literature on citation impact indicators. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2016**, 10, 365-391	3.1	476
72	The precision of the arithmetic mean, geometric mean and percentiles for citation data: An experimental simulation modelling approach. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2016**, 10, 110-123	3.1	39
71	Ranking authors using fractional counting of citations: An axiomatic approach. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2016**, 10, 183-199	3.1	26
70	How does prolific professors influence on the citation impact of their university departments?. *Scientometrics*, **2016**, 107, 941-961	3	6
69	An overview of global research effort in fisheries science. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, **2016**, 73, 1004-1011	2.7	29
68	Gender inequality and research performance: moving beyond individual-meritocratic explanations of academic advancement. *Studies in Higher Education*, **2016**, 41, 2044-2060	2.6	58
67	Three practical field normalised alternative indicator formulae for research evaluation. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2017**, 11, 128-151	3.1	54
66	The role of guarantor in scientific collaboration: The neighbourhood matters. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2017**, 11, 103-116	3.1	4

65	Quantifying and suppressing ranking bias in a large citation network. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2017**, 11, 766-782	3.1	30
64	Author Impact Metrics in Communication Sciences and Disorder Research. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, **2017**, 60, 2704-2724	2.8	8
63	How to standardize (if you must). *Scientometrics*, **2017**, 113, 825-843	3	1
62	Document type assignment accuracy in the journal citation index data of Web of Science. *Scientometrics*, **2017**, 113, 219-236	3	17
61	Avoiding obscure topics and generalising findings produces higher impact research. *Scientometrics*, **2017**, 110, 307-320	3	8
60	Research evaluation of authors citation-based performance through the relative author superiority index. *Transinformacao*, **2017**, 29, 191-201	1.5	3
59	Mapping international impact of Danish neuroscience from 2004 to 2015 using tailored scientometric methodology. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, **2018**, 47, 193-200	3.5	
58	Professionalization of bibliometric research assessment. Insights from the history of the Leiden Centre for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS). *Science and Public Policy*, **2018**, 45, 565-578	1.8	13
57	TSCBAS: A Novel Correlation Based Attribute Selection Method and Application on Telecommunications Churn Analysis. **2018**,		0
56	Do females create higher impact research? Scopus citations and Mendeley readers for articles from five countries. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2018**, 12, 1031-1041	3.1	29
55	Bibliography. **2018**, 341-375		
54	Research trends and collaborations by applied science researchers in South African universities of technology: 2007–2017. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, **2018**, 44, 468-476	1.5	2
53	Creativity in science and the link to cited references: Is the creative potential of papers reflected in their cited references?. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2018**, 12, 906-930	3.1	21
52	Author-weighted impact factor and reference return ratio: can we attain more equality among fields?. *Scientometrics*, **2018**, 116, 2097-2111	3	1
51	How well does I3 perform for impact measurement compared to other bibliometric indicators? The convergent validity of several (field-normalized) indicators. *Scientometrics*, **2019**, 119, 1187-1205	3	4
50	Performance Analysis Of Fuzzy Rough Set-Based And Correlation-Based Attribute Selection Methods On Detection Of Chronic Kidney Disease With Various Classifiers. **2019**,		1
49	Normalisation of citation impact in economics. *Scientometrics*, **2019**, 120, 841-884	3	24
48	On the interplay between normalisation, bias, and performance of paper impact metrics. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2019**, 13, 270-290	3.1	5

47	Comparison of two article-level, field-independent citation metrics: Field-Weighted Citation Impact (FWCI) and Relative Citation Ratio (RCR). *Journal of Informetrics*, **2019**, 13, 635-642	3.1	29
46	Public-private collaboration and scientific impact: An analysis based on Danish publication data for 19952013. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2019**, 13, 593-604	3.1	5
45	Globalised vs averaged: Bias and ranking performance on the author level. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2019**, 13, 299-313	3.1	2
44	Scholarly impact assessment: a survey of citation weighting solutions. *Scientometrics*, **2019**, 118, 453-478	3	21
43	Comparing the impact of subfields in scientific journals. *Scientometrics*, **2020**, 125, 625-639	3	1
42	How can citation impact in bibliometrics be normalized? A new approach combining citing-side normalization and citation percentiles. *Quantitative Science Studies*, **2020**, 1, 1553-1569	3.8	0
41	Rapid Generation of Challenging Simulation Scenarios for Autonomous Vehicles Based on Adversarial Test. **2020**,		
40	Should citations be field-normalized in evaluative bibliometrics? An empirical analysis based on propensity score matching. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2020**, 14, 101098	3.1	3
39	Improving the reliability of short-term citation impact indicators by taking into account the correlation between short- and long-term citation impact. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2020**, 14, 101019	3.1	2
38	Mean values of skewed distributions in the bibliometric assessment of research units. *Scientometrics*, **2020**, 125, 925-935	3	3
37	Unbiased evaluation of ranking metrics reveals consistent performance in science and technology citation data. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2020**, 14, 101005	3.1	11
36	Predicting Hot Spot Residues at Protein-DNA Binding Interfaces Based on Sequence Information. *Interdisciplinary Sciences, Computational Life Sciences*, **2021**, 13, 1-11	3.5	3
35	The lack of meaningful boundary differences between journal impact factor quartiles undermines their independent use in research evaluation. *Scientometrics*, **2021**, 126, 1495-1525	3	2
34	Development of a Scale to Measure Intrapersonal Psychological Empowerment to Participate in Local Tourism Development: Applying the Sociopolitical Control Scale Construct to Tourism (SPCS-T). *Sustainability*, **2021**, 13, 4057	3.6	1
33	Bibliometric indicators to evaluate scientific activity. *Radiologia*, **2021**, 63, 228-235	0.1	1
32	Bibliometric indicators to evaluate scientific activity. *Radiologia*, **2021**, 63, 228-235	0.6	1
31	New Indicators of the Technological Impact of Scientific Production. *Journal of Data and Information Science*, **2021**,	1.2	2
30	The effect of interdisciplinary components' citation intensity on scientific impact. *Library Hi Tech*, **2021**, ahead-of-print,	1.5	0

29	Convergent validity of several indicators measuring disruptiveness with milestone assignments to physics papers by experts. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2021**, 15, 101159	3.1	3
28	Weighted citation based on ranking-related contribution: a new index for evaluating article impact. *Scientometrics*, **2021**, 126, 8653-8672	3	1
27	Field Normalization of Scientometric Indicators. *Springer Handbooks*, **2019**, 281-300	1.3	13
26	The Substantive and Practical Significance of Citation Impact Differences Between Institutions: Guidelines for the Analysis of Percentiles Using Effect Sizes and Confidence Intervals. **2014**, 259-281		2
25	Peer Review and Bibliometric: Potentials and Problems. **2011**, 145-164		6
24	The implicit preference of bibliometrics for basic research. *Scientometrics*, **2020**, 124, 1411-1419	3	3
23	Analysis of bibliometric indicators to determine citation bias. *Palgrave Communications*, **2015**, 1,	5.3	3
22	Relative Citation Ratio (RCR): A new metric that uses citation rates to measure influence at the article level.		9
21	A reverse engineering approach to the suppression of citation biases reveals universal properties of citation distributions. *PLoS ONE*, **2012**, 7, e33833	3.7	62
20	Is It a Home Run? Measuring Relative Citation Rates in Accounting Research. *Accounting Horizons*, **2020**, 34, 67-91	1.8	5
19	Scholar Plot: Design and Evaluation of an Information Interface for Faculty Research Performance. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, **2019**, 4, 6	1.3	2
18	¿Tiene sentido limitar la coautorí científica? No existe inflaci de autores en Ciencias Sociales y Educaci en Espa. *Revista Espanola De Documentacion Cientifica*, **2018**, 41, 201	0.7	5
17	[Citation analysis of research articles from Norwegian health enterprises, 2005-2011]. *Tidsskrift for Den Norske Laegeforening*, **2014**, 134, 1466-70	3.5	1
16	A Study on Informetric Analysis for Measuring the Qualitative Research Performance. *Journal of the Korean Society for Information Management*, **2009**, 26, 377-394		1
15	Comparabilit entre domaines scientifiques. *Revue Economique*, **2015**, 66, 289	0.2	
14	An Index for SSRN Downloads. *SSRN Electronic Journal*,	1	1
13	Fuzzy Logic and Correlation-Based Hybrid Classification on Hepatitis Disease Data Set. *Lecture Notes on Data Engineering and Communications Technologies*, **2020**, 787-800	0.4	1
12	Squeeze excitation densely connected residual convolutional networks for specific emitter identification based on measured signals. *Measurement Science and Technology*, **2021**, 32, 025110	2	1

11	Scores of a specific field-normalized indicator calculated with different approaches of field-categorization: Are the scores different or similar?. *Journal of Informetrics*, **2022**, 16, 101241	3.1	0
10	Cascaded layer-coalescing convolution network for brain tumor segmentation. *Journal of Intelligent and Fuzzy Systems*, **2022**, 1-16	1.6	
9	Wavelet convolutional neural network for robust and fast temperature measurements in Brillouin optical time domain reflectometry.. *Optics Express*, **2022**, 30, 13942-13958	3.3	2
8	Comparative study of scaling parameters and research output of selected highly- and moderately-cited individual authors. *Journal of Computer Sciences Institute*, 23, 152-164		0
7	Relevance of document types in the scores calculation of a specific field-normalized indicator: Are the scores strongly dependent on or nearly independent of the document type handling?. *Scientometrics*,	3	
6	Thermal fluid fields reconstruction for nanofluids convection based on physics-informed deep learning. **2022**, 12,		0
5	Scientific Production in Portuguese Public Universities. **2022**, 47-58		0
4	Citation bias in measuring knowledge flow: Evidence from the web of science at the discipline level. **2022**, 16, 101338		1
3	Measuring the current state-of-the-art in lean healthcare literature from the lenses of bibliometric indicators.		0
2	Relationship between collaboration and normalized scientific impact in South American public universities. **2022**, 127, 6391-6411		0
1	Comparison of Network and Readability Properties With Traditional Bibliometric Properties in the Journal of Universal Computer Science. **2022**,		0