RESEARCH BODY REVIEW

American Cancer Society

A structured assessment of output, citation impact and the research communities behind the record.

DOCUMENT VERSION 2026-11-07 (UTC) / METRICS SNAPSHOT 2026-11-06

4,178	1,007,667	254
Indexed articles · all time	Peer-reviewed citations · all time	Indexed articles in 2025

THREE OBSERVATIONS

01 37.3% more indexed records

The count for 2025 is 254, compared with 185 in 2021. Recent-year coverage is unverified; this is not proof of a corresponding change in actual research activity.

02 24.8% in 2021–2025

The latest five complete publication years contribute 1,036 indexed articles. This describes output volume, not research quality.

03 88.0% from the top 10%

Among 961 articles published in 2016–2020, the most-cited tenth accounts for this share of recorded citations. A few papers can move the average substantially.

Generated automatically from the exaly database without manual editing. This is an external-data assessment, not an official publication of the organisation reviewed or an independent assurance audit. Underlying records have not been manually verified.

Current profile and updated data

https://exaly.com/research-body/224630

How has the research record changed?

Read publication output and citations received on separate scales. Both panels use complete calendar years; citations can refer to work published much earlier.

ANNUAL INDEXED ARTICLES



CITATIONS RECEIVED IN EACH YEAR



2016–2020: 961 articles / 2021–2025: 1,036 articles

Source: strict entity article list and annual citation series. 38 articles have no publication year and are absent from annual comparisons. Source build date does not establish complete coverage.

READING THE CHANGE

Recent indexing delays and changes in database coverage can move these counts. A lower indexed total is not sufficient evidence of declining research activity. Publication volume and citation attention answer different questions.

How broadly is citation attention distributed?

A fixed 2016–2020 publication cohort gives articles more time to accumulate citations. Counts are measured at the 2026-11-06 snapshot; this is not a field-normalised comparison.

30.0
Median citations per article
The midpoint of the cohort

316.0
Mean citations per article
Sensitive to highly cited papers

4.2%
No recorded citations
At the snapshot date

CUMULATIVE SHARE OF CITATIONS



Share of articles, starting with the most cited

COHORT CITATION BANDS

0 cites	1–9 cites	10–49 cites	50–199 cites	200+ cites
4.2%	16.5%	44.4%	23.4%	11.4%

INTERPRETATION

The cohort contains 961 articles and 303,715 citations. The dashed diagonal represents equal citation counts per article. Concentration alone does not establish weak or strong research.

Which parts of the institution shape its output?

School-level affiliations provide a practical view of research strengths. The units below are the largest by linked article count in 2021–2025, not a standardised subject taxonomy.

SCHOOL / AFFILIATION UNIT	ARTICLES	OF INSTITUTION	2021 → 2025
Department of and Health Services Research	18	1.7%	
Department of Data Science	5	0.5%	
Center for Statistics and Evaluation	1	0.1%	
Pediatrics	1	0.1%	
Health Policy	1	0.1%	
Radiation Oncology	1	0.1%	
Psychology	1	0.1%	

Coverage: 2.6% of recent articles link to at least one school

Source: school and institution article-list intersections. 7 units have recent output; up to eight are shown. Counts overlap. Sparklines use individual zero-based scales. Recent-year coverage is unverified.

READING THE RESEARCH MIX

One paper can be linked to several units. Unassigned records and uneven affiliation detail limit comparisons. School counts describe the available research mix; they do not establish field quality.

Which authors stand out in the institution record?

Authors assigned to this institution in exaly's published primary-affiliation field, ranked by citations to institution-linked papers. This is an algorithmic assignment, not verified current employment.

UP TO SIX EXAMPLES FROM THE INDEXED RECORD

01 Ahmedin Jemal

591 Linked articles

683,667 Linked citations

02 Rebecca L. Siegel

148 Linked articles

510,508 Linked citations

03 Kimberly D Miller

46 Linked articles

183,215 Linked citations

04 Hyuna Sung

72 Linked articles

161,337 Linked citations

05 Elizabeth Ward

71 Linked articles

113,580 Linked citations

06 Lindsey A Torre

17 Linked articles

107,672 Linked citations

These are examples of influential linked work, not a current staff directory, a productivity assessment per employee, or a fractional allocation of credit.

Source: strict institution article list and author maps, restricted to the published primary-institution assignment. Each coauthor receives full paper credit. Names link to current profiles.

BEFORE USING THIS FOR PEOPLE DECISIONS

Historical affiliations, author disambiguation and large collaborations affect these figures. Coauthored work can credit several people in full. Validate underlying records and context before drawing conclusions about individuals.

What can this assessment support?

A documented perspective on the indexed research record. Each indicator has a defined denominator and time window. Indicators are reported separately, without a composite score.

MEASURE	BASIS / INTERPRETATION
Scale	All-time indexed publications and citations from the entity's strict article list and counters.
Recent performance	Publication years 2021–2025. Compared with 2016–2020 where stated. Later publication years are excluded from these comparisons.
Citation distribution	961 articles published in 2016–2020; citations through this snapshot. Not field-normalised. Top shares round up to whole articles.
Research strengths	School-linked articles intersected with the institution record. Schools overlap and affiliation coverage is incomplete.
People examples	Exaly primary-affiliation assignment plus citations to institution-linked papers. Not verified employment or career totals.
Data limits	38 articles have no publication year. Author identities, affiliations and citation links are algorithmic records.

QUESTIONS FOR A FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

01 Does growth remain after accounting for changes in database coverage?

02 Do field mix, article age and indexing delays explain the citation pattern?

03 Are influential affiliations and author identities correctly resolved?

This report was generated automatically from the exaly database without manual editing. It is not issued or endorsed by the organisation reviewed and is not an independent assurance audit. No manual verification of underlying research or institutional records was performed.

Snapshot: 2026-11-06 · Document version: 2026-11-07 (UTC)

https://exaly.com/research-body/224630