2017

Web of Science v. Scopus: Presentation for the URI Deans' Council

Peter Larsen
University of Rhode Island, plarsen@uri.edu

Andrée Rathemacher
University of Rhode Island, andree@uri.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/lib_ts_presentations

Part of the Collection Development and Management Commons, Higher Education Commons, and the Scholarly Publishing Commons

Web of Science v. Scopus

Presentation for the URI Deans' Council
April 19, 2017
Peter Larsen • Andrée Rathemacher

UConn Study 2014

- Used 200+ hours of staff time
- Scopus had more journal records (183%), fewer book (72%) and proceedings records (89%)
- Use of Scopus increased, while Web of Science decreased (~3%/year each)
- Scopus is preferred by Undergraduates and Graduate Students
- Cost of Scopus is roughly half the cost of Web of Science
- UConn cancelled Web of Science after their survey

Scopus

Scopus

Pros

- Growing rapidly and filling in gaps in its coverage.
- Stronger in international literature than Web of Science
- A wide range of analysis metrics in tune with developments in scholarly communication
- Less expensive
- A more intuitive and user-friendly interface (at least for new users)

Cons

- Chronological depth
- Fewer records
- Potential for future price inflation

Scopus includes content from more than 5,000 publishers and 105 different countries

65M records from **22K** serials, **96K** conferences and **134K** books

- Updated daily
- More accurate and complete citation data pre-1996
- 40 different languages covered
- 3,487 Active Gold Open Access journals indexed

Physical Sciences 11,865	**JOURNALS**	**CONFERENCES**	**BOOKS**
Health Sciences 12,992	**22,411** peer-reviewed journals **322** trade journals	**96.4K** conference events **7.7M** conference papers	**539** book series **34K** Volumes / **1.3M** items **134,082** stand-alone books **>1.1M** items
Social Sciences 10,158			
Life Sciences 6,394	Full metadata, abstracts and cited references (ref's post-1995 only)	Mainly Engineering and Computer Sciences	Focus on Social Sciences and A&H

Examples of Scopus Article Metrics

Metrics Page

Metric details ?

Synergistic effects of climate-related variables suggest future physiological impairment in a top oceanic predator   Back to article
(2008) Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 105(52), pp. 20776-20780

Overview	Citations	Scholarly Activity Mendeley, CiteULike, etc.	Scholarly Commentary Blogs, Reviews, Wikipedia, etc.	Social Activity Twitter, Facebook, etc.

Overview

Citation Count 💬	Field-Weighted Citation Impact ⚖️	Citation Benchmarking %
160	**1.82**	90th percentile
Cited by in Scopus		Compared to Multidisciplinary articles of the same age and document type ?

Mendeley Ⓜ	Blogs 🅱	Wikipedia Ⓦ	Twitter 🐦
304 Readers	**1** Post	**2** Mentions	**4** Tweets

Scopus Analysis of URI Research Output

Analyze search results   ⏏ Export |

(AF-ID ("University of Rhode Island"   60010806))   Back to your search results

5466 document results   Choose date range to analyze: 2010 ▾ to 2017 ▾   **Analyze**

| Year | Source | Author | Affiliation | Country/Territory | Document type | **Subject area** |

Documents by subject area

Subject Area	Documents ⇅
Medicine	1229
Agricultural and Biological Sciences	1012
Engineering	814
Earth and Planetary Sciences	699
Environmental Science	690
Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecu…	604
Social Sciences	597
Computer Science	515
Chemistry	435
Pharmacology, Toxicology and Pha…	340
Physics and Astronomy	309
Materials Science	301
Psychology	288
Mathematics	273
Arts and Humanities	214
Chemical Engineering	209
Business, Management and Accou…	184
Immunology and Microbiology	169
Nursing	168

Pie chart — Documents by subject area:
- Medicine (22.5%)
- Agricultural an... (18.5%)
- Engineering (14.9%)
- Earth and Plane... (12.8%)
- Environmental S... (12.6%)
- Biochemistry, G... (11.1%)
- Social Sciences... (10.9%)
- Computer Scienc... (9.4%)
- Chemistry (8.0%)
- Undefined (0.0%)
- Other (57.6%)

Scopus Analysis of URI Research Output

Analyze search results

Export | Print | E-mail

(AF-ID ("University of Rhode Island"   60010806))   Back to your search results

5466 document results   Choose date range to analyze: 2010 to 2017 Analyze

| Year | Source | **Author** | Affiliation | Country/Territory | Document type | Subject area |

Author		Documents ≡
☑ He, H.	⌄	150
☑ Shukla, A.	⌄	115
☑ Seeram, N.P.	⌄	86
☑ Parang, K.	⌄	76
☑ De Groot, A.S.	⌄	72
☑ Lucht, B.L.	⌄	65
☑ Lohmann, R.	⌄	59
☑ Tiwari, R.K.	⌄	54
☑ Besio, W.G.	⌄	48
☑ McWilliams, S.R.	⌄	47
☐ Sun, Y.	⌄	46
☐ Moise, L.	⌄	41
☐ Martin, W.	⌄	41
☐ Prochaska, J.O.	⌄	39
☐ Redding, C.A.	⌄	39
☐ Kay, S.	⌄	36
☐ Preisser, E.L.	⌄	36

Documents by author
Compare the document counts for up to 15 authors

Web of Science

Pros

- Deep chronological coverage
- The Impact Factor is widely used
- URI has invested money in backfiles (sunk cost)
- Familiarity among the Faculty
- Stronger in Humanities than Scopus

Cons

- Confusing product structure; administration difficulties
- Slow response to changing research environment
- Corporate instability
- More expensive (Web of Science is currently the most expensive Indexing and Abstracting resource at URI by a wide margin)

WEB OF SCIENCE™

Who Uses Scopus?

Scopus and Web of Science

- Ohio State University
- Perdue
- Rutgers
- University of Iowa
- University of Minnesota
- University of Missouri
- University of Wisconsin Madison

Scopus only

- University of Connecticut
- UMass Medical School
- James Madison University
- University of Alabama at Birmingham
- University of North Carolina at Greensboro
- Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center
- University of Nebraska Medical Center
- Saint Louis University Medical Center
- University of Utah Health Sciences Library

Overall Content Comparison with Web of Science

Scopus

- ~24K titles
- >5,000 publishers
- Updated daily

Web of Science ™

- ~12K titles
- 3,300 publishers
- Updated weekly

Assumes customer subscribes to ALL:
- Science Citation Index (SCISEARCH)
- Social Science Citation Index
- Arts & Humanities Citation Index

Scopus 24,169 — Web of Science 12,491

Scopus 7,410 (+78%) / **WoS** 4,188 — Physical Sciences

Scopus 6,740 (+97%) / **WoS** 3,415 — Health Sciences

Scopus 4,436 (+50%) / **WoS** 2,954 — Life Sciences

Scopus 7,684 (+90%) / **WoS** 4,016 — Social Sciences

Source: Web of Science Real Facts, Web of Science Core Collection title list and Scopus' own data (April 2015)

Summary of Features

	Scopus	Web of Science
Journal Analyzer	Yes	Separate subscription to JCR is needed
Citation Overview	Yes	Yes
Exporting Document Metadata	20,000 documents – basic citation metadata 2,000 documents – all available metadata	10,000 documents – only to Endnote Web 500 documents - everything else
Results Analyzer	Yes, One Step, Includes visualization tools	Yes, Two Step, Summary table only
ORCID Integration	Yes	Yes
Update Frequency	Daily	Weekly
Cited Reference Search	Yes (two step process)	Yes (one step process)
Profiles	Algorithmic + user refinement; comprehensive	User created; only available in select instances
Author search	Searches algorithmic profiles clusters	Searches documents based on name, affiliation and discipline
Article Level Metrics	Citation, Social, Mass Media, Scholarly Commentary; Includes Percentile Scores	Usage data

Cost history

Subscription period	Web of Science	Scopus	Total URI spend
9/2013 - 8/2014	$███████	$0	$████████
9/2014 - 8/2015	$██████	$█████	$126,816
9/2015 - 8/2016	$██████	$██████	$130,340
9/2016 - 8/2017	$██████	$██████	$133,961
9/2017 - 8/2018	$██████	$█████ or less	$█████ or less