

# Uncovering impacts: CitedIn and total-impact, two new tools for gathering altmetrics.

Jason Priem  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
CB #3360, 100 Manning Hall  
Chapel Hill, NC  
priem@email.unc.edu

Cristhian Parra  
University of Trento  
Via Rodolfo Belenzani, 12  
Trento, Italy  
parra@disi.unitn.it

Heather Piwowar  
National Evolutionary Synthesis Center  
2024 W. Main Street, Suite A200  
Durham, NC  
hpiwowar@nescent.org

Andra Waagmeester  
Department of Bioinformatics,  
BiGCaT, Maastricht University  
P.O.Box 616, NL-6200 MD  
Maastricht The Netherlands  
andra.waagmeester@maastrichtuniversity.nl

## ABSTRACT

Although citations are useful for evaluating researchers and institutions, they only reflect a restricted segment of the impact spectrum. Growing scholarly use of Web tools, however, presents an opportunity to track alternative impacts along heretofore invisible paths like reading, bookmarking, and discussing. We introduce two tools, CitedIn and total-impact, that gather and report these and other “altmetrics.” After discussing the tools’ features, we use a set of 214 articles from a national research center as a case study. We find that both tools present a meaningful number and variety of altmetrics in a form that could be used for immediate evaluation, and call for more research into the properties and validity of altmetrics.

## Keywords

altmetrics, scientometrics, impact, scholarly communication, evaluation, tools

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Scientometricians and science administrators have for decades tracked formal citation to inform the measurement, evaluation, and study of science. This is possible because citations counts, for all their occasional ambiguity [1], do reflect use of scholarly products. However, this reflection is of a restricted spectrum; citation reflects but one kind of use, and scientists often use scholarly products in ways that do not perturb the citation record [2].

However, as scholarly workflows increasingly migrate to the Web, formerly “underground” uses like reading, bookmarking, sharing, discussing, and rating are beginning to leave online traces. The are becoming visible on Web pages [3][4], on blogs [5], in downloads [6][7], on social media like Twitter [8], and in social reference managers like CiteULike, Mendeley, and Zotero [9]. These alternatives to traditional citation analysis have been labeled “altmetrics” [10]. Altmetrics offer potential for gathering information on more diverse types of impact, from more diverse scholarly products, including blog posts, slides, datasets, or even tweets. They also have the important benefit of speed; altmetrics

typically accumulate in days or weeks rather than the years citations require. These advantages are particularly useful in evaluation of individuals and institutions, where decision-makers typically want as broad an understand of impact as possible, in as little time as possible. However, practical use of altmetrics for evaluation requires both a greater understanding of the properties and validity of these new metrics, and practical tools for obtaining them [11]. Others have begun the former [12][13]; this poster will pursue the latter, presenting two new tools for gathering and presenting altmetrics.

## 2. TOOLS FOR ALTMETRICS: CITEDIN AND TOTAL-IMPACT

CitedIn (<http://citedin.org>) and total-impact (<http://total-impact.org>) are open-source tools that receive as input a list of identifiers for scholarly products, and output a set of altmetrics for each product. CitedIn accepts only articles with PubMed IDs (PMIDs); total-impact accepts articles identified by PMID or DOI, but also datasets and slides using a variety of identifiers including URL, handle, and accession numbers.

Both tools allow users to input identifiers manually; CitedIn also offers a REST API, and total-impact lets users automatically populate the products list using items stored in Mendeley or Slideshare libraries. Once users have uploaded products, CitedIn and total-impact both use calls to open Web APIs to gather data about them; CitedIn also caches available databases. As of




Figure 1. CitedIn results page.




Figure 2. total-impact results page.

September 25, 2011, the data sources used by each are listed in Table 1.

In addition to gathering altmetrics from these sources, both tools also include some additional features. CitedIn lets users input and output data over a REST API, and also reports a “CI-number” that summarizes all altmetrics activity in a single value. Total-impact offers persistent URLs for impact report pages, which can then update over time. Both tools let users download results as structured text files for further analysis. Output pages for the tools are shown in Figures 1 and 2.

### 3. CASE STUDY: ALTMETRICS FOR A NATIONAL RESEARCH CENTER

We used a set of 214 articles from the National Evolutionary Synthesis Center (NESCent) as a realistic test for the two tools. NESCent were interested in tracking the impact of work they funded in a faster and more comprehensive way than citation analysis allowed—a typical use case for altmetrics tools. We entered the articles into CitedIn on August 14 2011, and into total-impact September 23 2011, then collected and analyzed the results.

All 214 articles had DOIs, and so were able to be processed by total-impact. Only 174 articles had the PMIDs required by CitedIn, so the CitedIn sample is smaller. Both tools showed that altmetric activity as measured by number of “altmetric events” (bookmarks, downloads, etc.) is relatively widespread across articles: CitedIn found at least one event on 95% of its articles, and total-impact on 85%. There were a mean of 28 and median of 16 events per CitedIn article, with a maximum of 678. Total-impact had a per-article mean of 92 events and a median of 19; the higher mean is due to Dryad dataset downloads, which accumulate more easily than other metrics, reaching a maximum of 2769 on one article.

We visualized the activity across articles using heatmaps, shown in Figures 3 and 4 to create a sort of “impact genome.” Only altmetrics with nonzero counts are shown, and counts of each altmetric are normalized by that metric’s maximum. Articles are arranged so that those with higher mean event counts across all metrics are further left.

Table 1. Data sources for CitedIn and total-impact

	CitedIn	total-impact
Data repositories, including locating datasets associated with a given publication	ABS, Ares, Alzgene, Biogrid, BredeWiki, Ctdatabase, cancerCell, ChdWiki, Cosmic, Ctd, Cutdb, Dejavu, HIFTFBS, HNF4, HaemB, Jaspar, Kegg, Mgi, Mint, Mpidb, Nfi Regulome Resource, Oreganno, MIDNCI, BIDReactome, BDB, PleiadesGenes, Gregransbase, Balmer Retinoic, Uniprot, Wikipathways, Wormbase, YTPdb, Zfin	Dryad (downloads of most popular file, package views, total downloads, total file views)
Social bookmarking and reference management tools	CiteULike, Connotea, Mendeley	CiteULike, Delicious, Mendeley (groups, readers)
Blogs and social media	Google Blogs, Nature Blogs	Facebook (clicks, comments, likes, shares)
Traditional citation	Google Books mentions	Citation in PubMed Central
Other	PubMed subsets, Citations from Wikipedia (pmid)	Citations from Wikipedia
PLoS ALM (for Public Library of Science articles only)	N/A	Connotea, citations (CrossRef, PubMed Central, Scopus), blog mentions(Nature Blogs, ResearchBlogging, Bloglines, Postgenomic), downloads (PDF, HTML, and XML), PubMed Central activity (abstract, citations, figures, full text, pdf, scanned pages, scanned summaries, supplemental data, unique IPs)




Figure 3. Active CitedIn event types and normalized event counts per article.




Figure 4. Active total-impact event types and normalized event counts per article.

## 4. CONCLUSION

Altmetrics have potential to improve the speed and breadth of scientific evaluation. CitedIn and total-impact are two tools in early development that aim to gather altmetrics. A test of these tools using a real-life dataset shows that they work, and that there is a meaningful amount of altmetrics data available--enough to inform evaluations of scholars and institutions in the field.

The properties and validity of these data, however, are still unclear, and call for additional research. What is the scholarly value of, for instance, a Mendeley bookmark or a Wikipedia citation? Future work should also investigate how altmetrics for different sets of articles can be compared; this is a particularly tricky problem given the high dimensionality of altmetrics data, and may benefit from better visualization techniques, or statistical approaches like principle component analysis and factor analysis.

Source code for CitedIn: <http://code.google.com/p/citedin>

Source code for total-impact: <https://github.com/mhahnel/total-impact>

Source code and data for analysis in this poster:

<https://github.com/jasonprien/altmetrics-tools-iConference-poster>

## 5. REFERENCES

- [1] L. Bornmann and H. D. Daniel, "What do citation counts measure? A review of studies on citing behavior," *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 64, no. 1, p. 45, 2008.
- [2] B. Cronin, *The hand of science: academic writing and its rewards*. Scarecrow Press, 2005.
- [3] L. Vaughan and K. Hysen, "Relationship between links to journal Web sites and impact factors," *Aslib Proceedings*, vol. 54, no. 6, pp. 356-361, 2002.
- [4] M. Thelwall, L. Vaughan, and L. Björneborn, "Webometrics," *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, vol. 39, no. 1, 2005.
- [5] P. Groth and T. Gurney, "Studying Scientific Discourse on the Web using Bibliometrics: A Chemistry Blogging Case Study," presented at the WebSci10: Extending the Frontiers of Society On-Line, Raleigh, NC: US., 2010.
- [6] J. Bollen, H. Van de Sompel, A. Hagberg, and R. Chute, "A principal component analysis of 39 scientific impact measures," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 4, no. 6, 2009.
- [7] T. Brody, S. Harnad, and L. Carr, "Earlier Web usage statistics as predictors of later citation impact," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, vol. 57, no. 8, pp. 1060-1072, 2006.
- [8] J. Priem and K. L. Costello, "How and why scholars cite on Twitter," in *Proceedings of the 73rd ASIS&T Annual Meeting*, Pittsburgh PA, USA, 2010.
- [9] D. Hull, S. R. Pettifer, and D. B. Kell, "Defrosting the Digital Library: Bibliographic Tools for the Next Generation Web," *PLoS Computational Biology*, vol. 4, no. 10, 2008.
- [10] J. Priem, D. Taraborelli, P. Groth, and C. Neylon, "altmetrics: a manifesto," 2010. [Online]. Available: <http://altmetrics.org/manifesto/>. [Accessed: 15-Aug-2011].
- [11] J. Priem and B. H. Hemminger, "Scientometrics 2.0: Toward new metrics of scholarly impact on the social Web," *First Monday*, vol. 15, no. 7, Jul. 2010.
- [12] H. Shema and J. Bar-Ilan, "Characteristics of Researchblogging.org science Blogs and Bloggers," presented at the altmetrics11: Tracking scholarly impact on the social Web (An ACM Web Science Conference 2011 workshop), Koblenz, Germany, 2011.
- [13] V. Uren and A.-S. Dadzie, "Relative Trends in Scientific Terms on Twitter," presented at the altmetrics11: Tracking scholarly impact on the social Web (An ACM Web Science Conference 2011 workshop), Koblenz, Germany, 2011.