

Genesis of Altmetrics or Article-level Metrics for Measuring Efficacy of Scholarly Communications: Current Perspectives

Anup Kumar Das^{1#} and Sanjaya Mishra²

¹Centre for Studies in Science Policy, School of Social Sciences - I, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi 110067, India

²Commonwealth Educational Media Centre for Asia (CEMCA), 13/14 Sarv Priya Vihar, New Delhi 110016, India

Abstract

The Article-level metrics or altmetrics becomes a new trendsetter in recent times for measuring impact of scientific publications and their social outreach to intended audiences. The popular social networks such as Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn and social bookmarks such as Mendeley and CiteULike are nowadays widely used for communicating research to larger transnational audiences. In 2012, the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) got signed by the scientific and researchers communities across the world. This Declaration has given preference to the article-level metrics (ALM) or altmetrics over traditional but faulty journal impact factor (JIF)-based assessment of career scientists. JIF does not consider impact or influence beyond citations count, as this count reflected only through Thomson Reuters' Web of Science® database. Also JIF provides indicator related to a journal, but not related to a published paper. Thus, altmetrics now becomes an alternative metrics for performance assessment of individual scientists and their contributed scholarly publications. This paper provides a glimpse of genesis of altmetrics in measuring efficacy of scholarly communications. This paper also highlights available altmetric tools and social platforms linking altmetric tools, which are widely used in deriving altmetric scores of scholarly publications.

Keywords: Altmetrics, Article-Level Metrics, Research Assessment, Research Communication, Citation Database, Science Communication.

1.0 Background

In 2014, the Science Citation Index (SCI) – a pioneering product of erstwhile Institute of Scientific Information (ISI) – completed a journey of fifty years. SCI is considered as the key enabler in making of topical areas of bibliometrics and scientometric. While SCI is completing its 50th anniversary, another related area – altmetrics or article-level metrics is gaining substantial popularity amongst scientific communities, research communicators and research funders. Open access (OA) movement at the beginning of the 21st century has strengthened online availability of scholarly publications across the world. The researchers and research communicators attribute the BBB open access declarations as game changers and greater enablers for promotion of scholarly research to larger communities beyond the researchers' fraternities, but also to common citizens and taxpayers. BBB declarations are a group of OA-related declarations namely Budapest Declaration in 2002, Berlin Declaration in 2003 and Bethesda Declaration in 2003 prompting public funded research to be made available and accessible in public domain. These declarations ensured majority of research

Corresponding author: anupdas2072[at]gmail[dot]com

publications will be distributed or disseminated through OA channels such as OA knowledge repositories (i.e., Green OA channel) and OA journals (i.e., Gold OA channel). In this process, a silent transformation also takes place. There is shift in measuring author's productivity from journal-level indicators to article-level metrics. The citation metrics using journal impact factor (JIF) and Journal immediacy index (JII) – both are associated with erstwhile SCI and now Web of Science® and Journal Citation Reports® of Thomson Reuter are felt inadequate in present circumstances while there is increased availability of scholarly publications in online public domain. Article-level metrics not only counts citations an individual research papers obtained, but also other influences such as number of downloads, social media share, coverage in news media, etc. The performance measurement for assessing research productivity of individual scientists, as obtained solely from counting number of citations or aggregate/average values of JIF, is no longer valued by funding agencies in developed countries. Rather they started impact evaluation of research publications or funded research projects very differently. Thus, altmetrics of a published paper is measured multi-dimensionally integrating its usage (downloads, views), peer-review (expert opinion), citations, and online interactions (storage, links, bookmarks, conversations).

The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA), signed in 2012 by the scientific and researchers communities across the world, has given preference to the article-level metrics (ALM) or altmetrics over traditional but faulty JIF-based assessment of career scientists. The concept of altmetrics explores the potentialities of social media and academic social networks, which helps in increasing global visibility, accessibility and readability of publications shared by the contributing authors. The researchers in the twenty first century are very keen to maintain online researchers' profiles in academic social networking websites. They are also interested in transnational networking through online discussion forums, and peer-to-peer collaborative platforms. While a plenty of general purpose social networking sites are globally available, some online social networks are meant for academics and researchers. Academic social networking websites facilitate creation of online groups for discussions based on particular research interests. Table 7 in later part of this paper provides an indicative list of social networking websites that facilitate networking of academics and researchers. All these social networking websites facilitate researchers in building their public profiles – listing their research publications, research projects, research positions or training. While ResearchGate.net, Academia.edu, LinkedIn.com and few others facilitate user-to-user interactions and e-collaborations through e-groups; getCITED.org, SSRN.com and few others don't have such web 2.0 features. Further details of some of these academic social networks are available in the following sub-sections.

2.0 Genesis and Institutional Frameworks

The Altmetrics Manifesto was published in 2010 by a group of enthusiasts and subsequently it becomes a baseline for a burgeoning altmetrics movement that achieves a global appreciation [Altmetrics.org/manifesto/]. In 2011 a dynamic organization was born to technologically support multidimensional measurements of published works, beyond citation counts. The name of this start-up company is Altmetric LLP, a new avatar in providing online services for generating article level metrics as a new performance indicator. Simultaneously, the concept of altmetrics is increasingly getting popular since the San

Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) was made public in 2012. Altmetric.com narrates its genesis, as describe below:

Altmetric LLP was founded by Euan Adie in 2011 and grew out of the burgeoning altmetrics movement. Euan had previously worked on Postgenomic.com, an open source scientific blog aggregator founded in 2006. Interested in taking the ideas from Postgenomic forward we entered an altmetrics app into Elsevier's Apps for Science competition and ended up winning. The prize money helped us to grow from an evenings & weekends project into a full-fledged product: the first standalone version of the Altmetric Explorer was released in February 2012. In July 2012 we took on additional investment from Digital Science. Our users now include some of the world's leading journals, funders and institutions. We remain a relatively small company and take pride in our strong focus on engineering and domain knowledge [Source: www.altmetric.com/about.php].

Since 2013, several scholarly journals and newsletters published special issues on Altmetrics. In 2013 the *Bulletin of the Association for Information Science & Technology* (Bulletin of the ASIS&T) published a special issue “*Altmetrics: What, Why and Where?*” with eight articles detailing altmetrics frameworks and possibilities. In the same year, *Information Standards Quarterly* (ISQ) published a special issue on Altmetrics with five articles and an editorial. In June 2014, *Research Trends* published a special issue “*Alternative Metrics*” with nine articles and an editorial (www.researchtrends.com/issue-37-june-2014/). Recently National Information Standards Organization (NISO) of the United States has initiated publishing a whitepaper as an outcome of its ongoing project *NISO Altmetrics Standards Project*. A draft version of *NISO Altmetrics Standards Project White Paper* got published in May 2014 (See www.niso.org/topics/tl/altmetrics_initiative/). In the same year, Leiden University of the Netherlands publishes a working paper titled *Do ‘Altmetrics’ Correlate with Citations? Extensive Comparison of Altmetric Indicators with Citations from a Multidisciplinary Perspective* (<http://arxiv.org/abs/1401.4321>).

The CWTS (Centre for Science and Technology Studies) of Leiden University has already initiated a *Research Line in Altmetrics* (www.cwts.nl/Altmetrics), where Altmetrics is studied under the umbrella of ‘Societal Impact of Research’. Similarly, LSE (London School of Economics and Political Science, United Kingdom) initiated the *LSE Impact of Social Sciences blog* in 2011, where different dimensions of article level metrics are greatly discussed on regular basis (see <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/tag/altmetrics/>). The number of institutions engaged in altmetrics research is growing in western countries. However, in the global south still there is no formal scholarly research project or research group engaged in depth studies in this nascent area.

The scholarly publishers, particularly open access publishers, have ridden over altmetrics movement to reach a new height. The Public Library of Science (PLOS) is the most pioneer and early implementer of altmetrics in their open access journals. Every article published in PLOS journals gives instant access to article level metrics (ALM) derived from their own algorithms and chosen data sources.

3.0 Growth of Literature on Altmetrics and Article-Level Metrics

For the purpose of this paper, the authors have performed an online search in Scopus database using search terms *TITLE-ABS-KEY(altmetric*) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(article-level metric*)*, searchable in the Title, Abstract and Keyword fields. The search query retrieved 70 documents as available within Scopus database on 22nd July 2014. Retrieved documents were further analysed to derive year-wise and country-wise distribution of published papers, top contributing authors, and top contributing institutions.

Figure 1 shows the year-wise distribution of papers since the origination or conceptualization of term article-level metrics in 2009. Year 2013 has been most productive in terms of producing literature on altmetrics. Till July 2014, only 14 documents published within year 2014 added to Scopus database. It is expected that more documents will be added for remaining part of year 2014 and will outnumber year 2013.

Figure 2 shows country-wise distribution of papers on the topic of altmetrics. The United States of America stands highest producing 21 papers, United Kingdom stands second with 17 papers and Canada stands third with 6 papers. Other contributing countries include Germany, Netherlands, China, Israel, Spain and Sweden. Countries have one paper each are namely Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Croatia, Hong Kong, India, Japan, Malaysia, Russian Federation and Switzerland.

Table 1 shows top cited papers on the topic of altmetrics. This Table also gives comparative scores of each paper's citations (cited by) statistics as recorded in both in Scopus database as well as Google Scholar search engine. Paper titled "Can tweets predict citations? Metrics of social impact based on Twitter and correlation with traditional metrics of scientific impact", published in 2011, attracted highest number of citations, i.e., cited by 59 papers. This paper also attracted 152 citations as recorded in Google Scholar (GS) database. Paper titled "Article-level metrics and the evolution of scientific impact", published in 2009 in PLOS Biology, received the second highest number of citations, i.e., cited by 34 papers as in Scopus and 82 papers as in GS.

Table 2 records the top cited papers as retrieved with GS search engine. Publication titled *Altmetrics: A Manifesto* gets maximum number of citations followed by some papers not covered in Scopus database. Papers appeared in altmetrics special issues of the Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science and Technology (2013) and Information Standards Quarterly (2013) respectively started receiving good number of citations. Interestingly, many of the papers appeared in Table 1 and Table 2 are open access contents or freely available online, as indicated in these two Tables.

Table 3 shows top contributing authors and their respective affiliation and country. M. Thelwall of United Kingdom contributed highest number of papers with six contributions on altmetrics topic as recorded in Scopus database, followed by J. Priem of the United States with five contributions. Other authors contributed three papers each. Interestingly, many of them associated with global altmetrics movement and projects related to altmetrics. Table 4 shows top contributing institutions in altmetrics area. The Statistical Cybermetrics Research Group of University of Wolverhampton, UK is top contributing institution and followed by the School of Information and Library Science of University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA. These institutions are also associated with global altmetrics movement and projects related to altmetrics.




Figure 1: Year-wise Distribution of Altmetrics Papers (as in Scopus till 22nd July 2014)




Figure 2: Country-wise Distribution of Altmetrics Papers (as in Scopus till 22nd July 2014)

Table 1: Top Ten Highly Cited Papers (as in Scopus till 22nd July 2014)

Paper Details	Cited by	GS Citations	OA Article
Eysenbach, G. (2011). Can Tweets Predict Citations? Metrics of Social Impact Based on Twitter and Correlation with Traditional Metrics of Scientific Impact. <i>Journal of Medical Internet Research</i> , 13(4).	59	152	Yes
Neylon, C., & Wu, S. (2009). Article-Level Metrics and the Evolution of Scientific Impact. <i>PLoS Biology</i> , 7(11), e1000242.	34	82	Yes
Piwowar, H. (2013). Altmetrics: Value All Research Products. <i>Nature</i> , 493(7431), 159-159.	16	58	No
Thelwall, M., Haustein, S., Larivière, V., & Sugimoto, C. R. (2013). Do Altmetrics Work? Twitter and Ten Other Social Web Services. <i>PloS One</i> , 8(5), e64841.	14	47	Yes
Ware, M. (2011). Peer Review: Recent Experience and Future Directions. <i>New Review of Information Networking</i> , 16(1), 23-53.	14	19	No
Priem, J., Groth, P., & Taraborelli, D. (2012). The Altmetrics Collection. <i>PloS One</i> , 7(11), e48753.	13	28	Yes
Yan, K. K., & Gerstein, M. (2011). The Spread of Scientific Information: Insights	10	23	Yes

from the Web Usage Statistics in PLoS Article-Level Metrics. <i>PLoS One</i> , 6(5), e19917.			
Schloegl, C., & Gorraiz, J. (2011). Global usage versus global citation metrics: The case of pharmacology journals. <i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology</i> , 62(1), 161-170.	10	16	No
Galligan, F., & Dias-Correia, S. (2013). Altmetrics: Rethinking the Way We Measure. <i>Serials Review</i> , 39(1), 56-61.	6	18	No
Jacsó, P. (2010). Eigenfactor and Article Influence Scores in the Journal Citation Reports. <i>Online Information Review</i> , 34(2), 339-348.	6	12	No

Table 2: Other Important Publications on Altmetrics covered in Google Scholars Search Engine

Paper Details	GS Citations	OA Article
Priem, J., Taraborelli, D., Groth, P., & Neylon, C. (2010). <i>Altmetrics: A Manifesto</i> .	114	Yes
Priem, J., Piwowar, H. A., & Hemminger, B. M. (2012). Altmetrics in the Wild: Using Social Media to Explore Scholarly Impact. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:1203.4745</i> .	67	Yes
Roemer, R. C., & Borchardt, R. (2012). From Bibliometrics to Altmetrics A Changing Scholarly Landscape. <i>College & Research Libraries News</i> , 73(10), 596-600.	21	Yes
Adie, E., & Roe, W. (2013). Altmetric: Enriching Scholarly Content with Article-Level Discussion and Metrics. <i>Learned Publishing</i> , 26(1), 11-17.	18	Yes
Konkiel, S., & Scherer, D. (2013). New Opportunities for Repositories in the Age of Altmetrics. <i>Bulletin of the ASIS&T</i> , 39(4), 22-26.	15	Yes
Piwowar, H., & Priem, J. (2013). The Power of Altmetrics on a CV. <i>Bulletin of the ASIS&T</i> , 39(4), 10-13.	15	Yes
Buschman, M., & Michalek, A. (2013). Are Alternative Metrics Still Alternative?. <i>Bulletin of the ASIS&T</i> , 39(4), 35-39.	13	Yes
Mohammadi, E., & Thelwall, M. (2014). Mendeley Readership Altmetrics for the Social Sciences and Humanities: Research Evaluation and Knowledge Flows. <i>Journal of the ASIS&T</i> , 65(8), 1627-1638.	13	No
Binfield, P. (2009). PLoS One: Background, Future Development, and Article-Level Metrics. <i>Rethinking Electronic Publishing, ELPUB</i> , 69-86.	12	Yes
Mounce, R. (2013). Open Access and Altmetrics: Distinct but Complementary. <i>Bulletin of the ASIS&T</i> , 39(4), 14-17.	11	Yes
Tananbaum, G. (2013). <i>Article-Level Metrics: A SPARC Primer</i> . Available at www.sparc.arl.org/sites/default/files/sparc-alm-primer.pdf	7	Yes

Table 3: Top Authors in Altmetrics (as in Scopus till 22nd July 2014)

Name of Author	Affiliation	Country	No. of papers
Thelwall, M.	Statistical Cybermetrics Research Group, Faculty of Science and Engineering, University of Wolverhampton, Wolverhampton	U.K.	6
Priem, J.	School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	USA	5
Groth, P.	Department of Computer Science and The Network Institute, VU University Amsterdam	Netherlands	3
Bar-Ilan, J.	Department of Information Science, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan	Israel	3
Haustein, S.	École de bibliothéconomie et des sciences de l'information, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada; b Science-Metrix, Montréal	Canada	3
Peters, I.	Department of Information Science, Heinrich-Heine-University, Düsseldorf	Germany	3
Piwowar, H.	Department of Biology, Duke University	USA	3
Terliesner, J.	Department of Information Science, Heinrich Heine University, Duesseldorf	Germany	3

Table 4: Top Institutions in Altmetrics (as in Scopus till 22nd July 2014)

Name of Institution and Country	No. of papers
Statistical Cybermetrics Research Group, University of Wolverhampton, Wolverhampton, U.K.	6
School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA	6
Department of Information Science, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel	3
VU University, Amsterdam, Netherlands	3
École de bibliothéconomie et des sciences de l'information, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada	3
Department of Information Science, Heinrich-Heine-University, Düsseldorf, Germany	3
School of Information and Library Science, Indiana University, USA	3

4.0 Altmetrics Tools

The Altmetric LLP remains a pioneer in providing altmetric-related solutions to specifically academic publishers, who would embed altmetric score in each scholarly article they publish in their e-journal gateways. Thus, altmetric score of an online scholarly article is instantly known to visitors of that particular e-journal. In some cases, readers even have convenient options to share bibliographic details of 'liked' papers through their social media account. Here, users can instantly share any of these papers through Facebook, Twitter, Google+, LinkedIn, Mendeley, CiteULike or similar interactive social networks.

Figure 3 shows an indicative list of altmetrics tools available to the publishers, funders and researchers. In this Figure, symbol '#' denotes that these web services are not comprehensive ones, only provide some aspects of altmetrics. Some web services which have discontinued their experimental beta version of potential altmetric application (but referred in other publications) are not included in this Figure, namely ReaderMeter.org, CrowdoMeter.org and ScienceCard.org. Presently, serious contenders of altmetric tools which have much comprehensive approaches are namely Altmetric.com, ImpactStory.org, PlumAnalytics.com and PLOS Article-Level Metrics (ALMs). Whereas providers such as PeerEvaluation.org yet to generate a critical mass to be considered as serious contenders of altmetric tools. Some of these tools are also mentioned in the Altmetrics.org/tools/ website. Table 5 provides a comparative analysis of major altmetrics providers, namely, Altmetric.com, ImpactStory.org, and PlumAnalytics.com. As indicated in this Table, some of the functionalities are common in every platform. These websites provides API (application programming interface) and bookmarklet to publishers and users to fetch altmetric data from different sources. For example Altmetric API of Altmetric.com is an API that enables a publisher to enrich their article pages with article level metrics data. It helps system to system interaction and obtaining ALM data from different data sources as indicated later. Similarly, Altmetric bookmarklet of Altmetric.com is a simple browser tool that lets a researcher instantly gets ALM data for any recent paper. It is a kind of browser plugin that can be integrated into researcher's web browser Chrome, Firefox or Safari.




Figure 3: Altmetrics Tools Available to the Publishers, Funders and Researchers

Table 5: Major Altmetrics Providers

	Altmetric.com	ImpactStory.org	PlumAnalytics.com
Target Group	Researchers, Publishers, Librarians, Editors, Funders	Researchers, Publishers, Funders	Researchers, Publishers, Funders
Founded in	2011	2012	2011
Mission	To track and analyse the online activity around scholarly literature.	Discover the full impact of your research.	To figure out more accurate ways of assessing research by analyzing the five categories of metrics: – Usage – Captures – Mentions – Social Media – Citations
Functionalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Authors should be able to see the attention that their articles are receiving in real-time. – Publishers, librarians and repository managers should be able to show authors and readers the conversations surrounding their content. – Editors should be able to quickly identify commentary where a response is required. – Researchers should be able to see which recent papers their peers think are interesting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Researchers who want to know how many times their work has been downloaded, bookmarked, and blogged. – Research groups who want to look at the broad impact of their work and see what has demonstrated interest. – Funders who want to see what sort of impact they may be missing when only considering citations to papers. – Repositories who want to report on how their research products are being discussed. – All of us who believe that people should be rewarded when their work (no matter what the format) makes a positive impact (no matter what the venue). – Aggregating evidence of impact will facilitate appropriate rewards, thereby encouraging additional openness of useful forms of research output. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Assess your impact – Track immediate impact – Gain an advantage – Measure all of your output – Group metrics – Answer important questions

5.0 Deriving Altmetric Scores

i) Using Altmetric.com

As indicated in Figure 4, Altmetric Explorer of the Altmetric.com derives altmetric scores from a weighted algorithm covering article-level statistics of viewed, downloaded, cited, saved and discussed. A scholarly article's popularity, usage, acceptance and availability are reflected in an altmetric score. Only articles with DOI (digital object identifier) are considered in arriving at a conclusive altmetric score. Thus, primary requirement for having an altmetric score is to establish DOI of every published article in electronic journals. Altmetric.com covers about 900+ news sources across the world. Most of them belong to developed or western countries. Few of them belong to developing countries. About 20 news sources are covered from India, namely. The Hindu, Hindustan Times, Times of India, Deccan Herald, Indian Express, the Telegraph, DNA, Asian Age, Business Standard, Dainik Jagran, Dainik Bhaskar, etc. So, if a scholarly article is mentioned in any of the news item in 900+ news sources, an altmetric score gets a higher value.




Figure 4: Deriving an Altmetric Score

Altmetric Badge: Altmetric.com provides a ready-to-use embeddable badge to journal publishers. This badge is embeddable in an article page to help the publishers showcasing impact in a beautiful way. This tool generates small donut shaped multicolour, multilayer visualisations to quickly convey information about each article, with summary of score from different data sources. Figure 5 shows an Altmetric badge depicting how an article is being outreached and appraised through social media. However, this altmetric score does not include download statistics of the said article.




Figure 5: An Altmetric Badge




Figure 6: Data Sources for PLOS Article Level Metrics

ii) Using PLOS ALM

The PLOS (Public Library of Science) is one of the pioneering publisher that introduced article level metrics for its open access journals much earlier than many other e-journal gateways. PLOS article level metrics derive from different data sources as indicated in Figure 6. It include counts with respect to usage, views, downloads, citations, social bookmarking,

blogs, media coverage and comments. Figure also indicates that PLOS ALM gets view or download statistics not only from PLOS journals but also from the PubMed Central database. Text Box 1 indicates purposes, usages and target users of PLOS article level metrics. It also helps you understand how PLOS ALM functions. PLOS metrics can be customized to address the needs of researchers, publishers, institutional decision makers, and funders.

Text Box 1: Understanding PLOS Article Level Metrics

PLOS Article Level Metrics

Purpose: ALMs provide a suite of established metrics that measure the overall performance and reach of published research articles.

For Whom

- **Researchers:** Maximize the impact of your research.
- **Publishers:** Enhance publication value through real-time views of reach and influence.
- **Institutions:** Capture researcher impact for hiring, tenure, and promotion decisions.
- **Funders:** Track the performance and impact of research funding.

Article-Level Metrics measure the dissemination and reach of published research articles. Traditionally, the impact of research articles has been measured by the publication journal. But a more informative view is one that examines the overall performance and reach of the articles themselves. Article-Level Metrics are a comprehensive set of impact indicators that enable numerous ways to assess and navigate research most relevant to the field itself, including:

- usage
- citations
- social bookmarking and dissemination activity
- media and blog coverage
- discussion activity and ratings

Article-Level Metrics are available, upon publication, for every article published by PLOS. Researchers can stay up-to-date with their published work and share information about the impact of their publications with collaborators, funders, institutions, and the research community at large. These metrics are also a powerful way to navigate and discover others' work. Metrics can be customized to address the needs of researchers, publishers, institutional decision-makers, or funders.

Source: <http://article-level-metrics.plos.org/alm-info/>

iii) Using ImpactStory.org

The ImpactStory.org is another leading provider of article level metrics data. This website offers registered users creating their impact profile on the web, revealing diverse impacts of their articles, datasets, software, and more. This is a collaborative not-for-profit open source project supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and Open Society Foundation. ImpactStory.org helps in creating author's profile and adding publication list through importing bibliographic records from different sources such as Scopus database, ORCID.org, Google Scholar Citations, SlideShare.net and many others.

A researcher can create a profile for free in this website to know how many times his/her work has been downloaded, bookmarked, and blogged. A researcher can also generate code to embed ImpactStory profile into his institutional CV and research blog. The homepage of ImpactStory profile of a registered researcher shows a list of contributed papers or presentations. These are categorised as **<highly saved>**, **<highly discussed>**, **<highly cited>**, **<saved>**, **<discussed>**, **<cited>**, and **<viewed>**. When you click on title of a paper you will get a detail ALM score indicating counts from different data sources.

iv) Using PlumAnalytics.com

The fourth major altmetric provider is the PlumAnalytics.com. It categorizes metrics into five separate types: Usage, Captures, Mentions, Social Media, and Citations. Plum Analytics tracks more than 20 different types of artifacts, including journal articles, books, videos, presentations, conference proceedings, datasets, source code, cases, and more. Figure 7 indicates different data sources used in PlumAnalytics for deriving altmetrics of scholarly publications. As indicated here, PlumAnalytics also includes citation statistics from global patent databases. This is very unique, as compared to other three altmetrics providers.




Figure 7: Data Sources for PlumAnalytics.com Article Level Metrics

6.0 Social Networks Helping Improvement of Researchers' Altmetric Scores

As we saw in the earlier sections, altmetrics data are derived from various social media and social bookmarking platforms. Researchers of the twenty first century need to collaborate with transnational researchers for a successful academic career. They have increased their visibility and participation at the global level through maintaining online profiles, both in general and academic social networking platforms. Their participation in transnational e-groups in online forums, including email-based forums, increased possibilities of peer-to-peer collaborations. While a plenty of general purpose social networking sites are globally available, some online social networks are meant for academics and researchers. Academic social networks facilitate creation of online groups for discussion based on particular research interests. Table 6 provides an indicative list of general purpose social networking websites that also facilitate networking of academics and researchers, beside other citizens. Table 7 provides an indicative list of special purpose websites that mainly facilitate social networking of academics and researchers. While ResearchGate and Academia.edu facilitate user-to-user interactions through e-groups, getCITED.org and Social Science Research Network (SSRN.com) don't have such web 2.0 feature. These academic research networks also ensure peer-to-peer communications through special interest e-groups, where sometimes membership is offered based on prior publications or prior contributions in the research fields.

Table 6: Important General Purpose Social Networks useful for Authors and Researchers

	Facebook	Twitter	Google+	LinkedIn	SlideShare	FigShare
Target Group	Any citizen	Any citizen	Any citizen	Professionals	Researchers; Professionals	Researchers
Founded	2004	2006	2011	2003	2006	2011
Mission	To give people the power to share and make the world more open and connected.	To give everyone the power to create and share ideas and information instantly, without barriers.	To bring the nuance and richness of real-life sharing to the web, and making all of Google better by including people, their relationships and their interests.	Connect the world's professionals to make them more productive and successful.	The world's largest community to share and upload presentations online.	Publish all of your research outputs!
Public Profile of Individuals	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Type of Social Media	General purpose.	General purpose.	General purpose.	Professional	Format specific	Format specific
Acceptable Formats	-	-	-	-	Presentations	Datasets, Figures and Tables

Table 7: Major Academic Social Networks

	ResearchGate.net	Academia.edu	getCITED.org	SSRN.com
Target Group	Researchers	Academics: researchers, students	Researchers	Researchers, Authors
Founded in	2008	2008	2004	1994
Subject Coverage	All	All	All	Social Sciences, Humanities and Law
Mission	To give science back to the people who make it happen and to help researchers build reputation and accelerate scientific progress.	To accelerate the world's research; to make science faster and more open.	To make records of scholarly work publicly available.	To provide rapid worldwide distribution of research to authors and their readers and to facilitate communication among them at the lowest possible cost.
Account Creation	Free	Free	Free	Free
Public Profile of Researchers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Web 2.0 Interactivity	Yes	Yes	No	No

7.0 Using Online Social Bookmarks and Reference Managers for Improving Altmetric Scores

As we saw in the earlier sections, altmetrics data are also derived from online social bookmarks, and citation or reference managers. Some of the online reference managers also act as PDF organizers, and let others know which papers you read, reviewed or referred to your colleagues. Some of these citation managers also help you to produce subject bibliographies, based on recommended reading lists of your colleagues and e-group members. Thus, online reference managers and social bookmarks play important roles in deciding popularity metrics of research publications accessible online. Individual scholars also get tremendous encouragement when they see their publications are stored, reviewed, recommended and shared by e-groups. There also researchers can create online public profile for highlighting their research publications and reading lists. Table 8 briefly describes major online reference managers and social bookmarks, namely, CiteULike.org, Mendeley.com, Delicious.com and Zotero.org. Zotero is not presently linked to Altmetric.com. Similar few more online reference managers exist, but these are not linked to any altmetric tool used for deriving altmetric score. Some online reference managers, not mentioned in Table 8 although exist, are namely Flow (Flow.proquest.com), EndNote Basic (Endnote.com/basic/), and Google Scholar Library (Scholar.google.com). Here also users can create online account for storing references and preparing bibliographies. These are also extensively used by researchers across disciplines. Some reference managers have desktop versions, which are freely downloadable and can be integrated with online accounts. Examples of desktop versions of reference managers are Mendeley and Zotero. EndNote also has a desktop version of reference manager, although that is not freely available. ProQuest's RefWorks is a reference manager having both online and desktop version. RefWorks' simplified and free version is named Flow, which was launched in 2013 by ProQuest Inc. to be an earnest competitor of the Mendeley, EndNote Basic and Zotero. They will compete each other to increase their market share in the growing segment of online reference managers. Some of them will also be measured for deriving altmetric score of stored or shared research publications.

Table 8: Major Online Reference Managers and Social Bookmarks

	CiteULike	Mendeley	Delicious	Zotero
Target Group	Researchers	Academics: Researchers, Students	Researchers, Professionals	Researchers
Founded in	2004	2008	2003	2006
About	A free service for managing and discovering scholarly references	A free reference manager and academic social network that can help you organize your research, collaborate with others online, and discover the latest research.	Never lose a link again: Delicious is a free and easy tool to save, organize and discover interesting links on the web.	A free, easy-to-use tool to help you collect, organize, cite, and share your research sources.
Ownership		Elsevier B.V.	Science Inc.	Center for History and New Media at George Mason University, USA
Account Creation	Free	Free	Free	Free

8.0 Conclusion

Nowadays the researchers' communities along with research funding agencies are giving much importance to altmetrics, due to better reflection of social impact and outreach of scientific publications using altmetric tools. However, scientific communities in the developing countries are still naïve in handling highly-interactive academic communication channels available to them with web 2.0 readiness. They need to have necessary information and digital literacy competencies to be conversant with born-digital documents and sharing them with academic social networking platforms. The new-age researchers need to understand and grasp changing landscape of research communications, particularly which are helping global visibility of research communications. To become a successful researcher, one should first become a successful research communicator. One's altmetric score will be increased significantly if he/she manages to reach out to researchers in his/her core and peripheral subject areas using wide array of social networking platforms available to them. Thus, the nuance of research communication is commensurate with knowledge diffusion to the society.

9.0 References and Further Readings

- Costas, R., Zahedi, Z., & Wouters, P. (2014). Do altmetrics correlate with citations? Extensive comparison of altmetric indicators with citations from a multidisciplinary perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1401.4321*.
- DORA (2012). *The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)*. USA: American Society for Cell Biology (ASCB). Retrieved from <http://www.ascb.org/dora/files/SFDeclarationFINAL.pdf>
- Fenner, M. (2013). Letter from the Guest Content Editor: Altmetrics Have Come of Age. *Information Standards Quarterly*, 25(2): 3.
- Liu, J. & Adie, E. (2014). Realising the Potential of Altmetrics within Institutions. *Ariadne*, Issue 72. Retrieved from <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue72/liu-adie>
- Piwowar, H. (2013). Introduction – Altmetrics: What, Why and Where?. *Bulletin of the Association for Information Science & Technology*, 39(4), 8-9.
- Piwowar, H. (2013). Altmetrics: Value All Research Products. *Nature*, 493(7431), 159-159.
- Priem, J., Piwowar, H. A., & Hemminger, B. M. (2012). Altmetrics in the wild: Using social media to explore scholarly impact. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:1203.4745. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1203.4745>
- Priem, J., Taraborelli, D., Groth, P., & Neylon, C. (2010). *Altmetrics: A Manifesto*. Retrieved from <http://altmetrics.org/manifesto/>
- Tananbaum, G. (2013). *Article Level Metrics: A SPARC Primer*. Retrieved from <http://sparc.arl.org/sites/default/files/sparc-alm-primer.pdf>
- Taylor, M., Halevi, G. and Moed, H.F. (2014). Special Issue on Alternative Metrics. *Research Trends*, 37, 01. Retrieved from <http://www.researchtrends.com/category/issue-37-june-2014/>
- Thelwall, M., Haustein, S., Larivière, V., & Sugimoto, C. R. (2013). Do Altmetrics Work? Twitter and Ten Other Social Web Services. *PloS One*, 8(5), e64841.

Acknowledgement

This paper is an outcome of a study carried out under the auspices of UNESCO-CEMCA Project titled “Development of Curricula and Self-Directed Learning Tools on Open Access”. The authors greatly acknowledge supports and professional inputs received from the UNESCO and CEMCA. The authors are also thankful to Dr. Bidyarthi Dutta of DLIS, Vidyasagar University, West Bengal, India for his valuable feedbacks while preparation of this paper.

*_*_*