

**SHARE** Weighted relative citation ratio means the research success ?

**Yoshiyasu Takefuji**, Professor,  
Keio University

(29 June 2017)

Jocelyn Kaiser described that NIH has a new research productivity measurement based on weighted relative citation ratio (1). John P.A. et al., mentioned that review articles receive more citations than articles with new empirical data (2). Editorial also states that reviews receive higher citations than original research papers (3). Authors like citing review paper because they offer a way to cite a single paper to support multiple statements (4). It's also easier to locate a recent review paper than to find the originals which might be quite old (4). This is why review papers are often highly cited (4). However, is this fair? The review paper authors may not have contributed anything to the discoveries they summarized, yet they end up getting (some of) the credit for them (4). Derek Lowe also stated that great papers that have been rejected (5). NIH should change their minds on how to evaluate successful research, not by quantitative tools including weighted relative citation ratio, but by qualitative tools including survey and interview.

1. Jocelyn Kaiser, Critics challenge NIH finding that bigger labs aren't necessarily better, *Science* 356 (6342), 997, 2017

2. John P.A. et al., Citation Metrics: A Primer on How (Not) to Normalize, *PLOS biology*, September 6, 2016

<http://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.100...>

3. Citation data: the wrong impact, *Nature Neuroscience* 1, 641 - 642 (1998)

4. Blog of neuroskeptic, "Ethics of citations," March 12, 2017

<http://blogs.discovermagazine.com/neuroskeptic/2017/03/12/the-ethics-of-...>

5. Derek Lowe, Great Papers That Have Been Rejected, September 10, 2013

[http://blogs.sciencemag.org/pipeline/archives/2013/09/10/great\\_papers\\_th...](http://blogs.sciencemag.org/pipeline/archives/2013/09/10/great_papers_th...)