Finding How Often Your Work is Cited (avoid counting duplicates)

In each database, find your article(s).

**CINAHL:** look at each article in the list to see if it has Times Cited in this Database(??). Click on this link to see citations of the citing article; check the date to see if it’s useful this year.

**Web of Science:** At “Basic search” pulldown, choose “Cited Reference Search”. Fill out the “Cited Reference Search” fields, using as little information as possible, to search for your articles. Search. Select the articles that are yours. Click FINISH SEARCH. Check the list to see if any qualify for this year.

**Google Scholar:** Go to Advanced Scholar Search, enter your name, choose the variation(s) that seem to be you. Look at each citation for Cited by ?? then review to see if any qualify for this year. They’ve also added a new feature, My Citations, which requires choosing your name variations and setting up a profile.

Google Scholar Metrics. "Scholar Metrics summarize recent citations to many publications, to help authors as they consider where to publish their new research. To get started, you can browse the top 100 publications in several languages, ordered by their five-year h-index and h-median metrics (http://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=top_venues). You can also search for publications by their titles, and then compare the publications that are of interest to you. Finally, if you wish to see which articles in a publication were cited the most and who cited them, click on its h-index number to view the articles as well as the citations underlying the metrics."

To learn more about Google Scholar Metrics:
But beware: http://www.jacso.info/h-gs/

UW Health Science Library Guide on Impact & Citations:
http://libguides.hsl.washington.edu/impactfactors

Duquesne Library Guide on Impact
http://guides.library.duq.edu/scholarlyimpact
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And of course, I must share the community’s concerns about citations and “Impact Factor”.

From: Not-so-deep impact, Nature 435, 1003-1004 (23 June 2005) | doi: 10.1038/4351003a

“Attempts to quantify the quality of science are always fraught with difficulty, and the journal impact factors are among the few numbers to persist. The result is an overemphasis of what is really a limited metric. …

The net result of all these variables is a conclusion that impact factors don't tell us as much as some people may think about the respective quality of the science that journals are publishing. Neither do most scientists judge journals using such statistics; they rely instead on their own assessment of what they actually read.

None of this would really matter very much, were it not for the unhealthy reliance on impact factors by administrators and researchers' employers worldwide to assess the scientific quality of nations and institutions, and often even to judge individuals. There is no doubt that impact factors are here to stay. But these figures illustrate why they should be handled with caution.”

From: The Impact Factor Game: It is time to find a better way to assess the scientific literature. PLoS Medicine, 3(6): e291. 2006 June

“…a journal's impact factor says nothing at all about how well read and discussed the journal is outside the core scientific community or whether it influences health policy…. Thomson Scientific has no explicit
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process for deciding which articles other than original research articles it deems as citable. We conclude that science is currently rated by a process that is itself unscientific, subjective, and secretive. Other measures of scientific impact may also become widely adopted, such as the usage factor, which is being promoted by the United Kingdom Serials Group (http://www.uksg.org/usagefactors), or the Y factor, a combination of both the impact factor and the weighted page rank, developed by Google (http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs11192-006-0176-z). “…If authors are going to quote the impact factor of a journal, they should understand what it can and cannot measure. The opening up of the literature means that better ways of assessing papers and journals are coming—and we should embrace them.”

Eigenfactor: comparisons using ISI’s citation reports in a different way: http://www.eigenfactor.org/

SNIP (source normalized impact per paper) http://www.journalmetrics.com/
“… new indicator of journal citation impact, denoted as source normalized impact per paper (SNIP). It measures a journal’s contextual citation impact, taking into account characteristics of its properly defined subject field, especially the frequency at which authors cite other papers in their reference lists, the rapidity of maturing of citation impact, and the extent to which a database used for the assessment covers the field’s literature.” Sponsored by Elsevier’s Scopus.

And lastly:
“The very imperfect cited referencing of many of the scholarly authors (including this very author), and the maddeningly complicated variations of citation styles, makes any citation-based evaluation just an approximation at best [emphasis added]” (Jacso, 2010, p. 227)
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