1

Impact of Cumulative Impact Factors

EUGENE GARFIELD

Chairman Emeritus, Institute for Scientific Information, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA

Most of you have heard about journal impact factors and even used them in one fashion or another? And probably you're also aware that there is considerable controversy about the use of citation analysis to evaluate scientists and institutions. But remarkably, journal impact factors seem to be minimally controversial. Of the many quantitative measures derived from the *Science Citation Index*[®], impact factors are probably of the *SCI Journal Citation Reports*[®] but it may also be due to the lack of any subjective approach that is manageable in evaluating thousands of publications.

The current impact factors is calculated from two basic items of information, a) the number of articles published in two prior consecutive years and b) the number of citations to those articles in the current year. The following illustrates this calculation for the journal *Cell*.



Basing the current citation impact on the output for the two previous years was not accidental - in 1966, 26% of citations (Table 1) of all references cited were to the current year and the two previous year.

Reference Year	% of Unique Ref Items	Cum % of Unique Ref Items	% of Total Citations	Cumulative % of Total Citations
66	3.31	3.31	2.65	2.65
65	10.79	14.10	11.50	14.15
64	11.24	25.34	12.45	26.60
63	9.55	34.89	10.41	37.01
62	8.00	42.89	8.55	45.56
61	6.62	49.51	7.00	52.56
60	5.85	55.36	6.05	58.61
59	4.82	60.18	4.94	63.55
58	4.11	64.29	4.20	67.75
57	3.52	67.81	3.61	71.36
56	3.12	70.93	3.16	74.52
55	2.79	73.72	2.77	77.29
54	2.41	76.13	2.31	79.60
53	2.12	78.25	2.11	81.71
52	1.88	80.13	1.85	83.56
51	1.64	81.77	1.65	85.21
50	1.47	83.24	1.39	86.60
49	1.22	84.4 6	1.18	87.78
48	1.08	85.54	0.94	88.72
47	0.78	86.32	0.67	89.39
46	0.60	86.92	0.56	89.95
45	0.49	87.41	0.45	90.40

Table 1. Science Citation Index[®] 1996. Chronological distribution of citations to authored items (non-patents).

Surprisingly, the 26% figure reported in 1966 has declined to 19%. Table 2 shows the relevant pages of the SCI Guide.

Table 3 shows relevant data enlarged. one can only speculate as to why this is happening.

Note that there is a decline from 9,98 in 1993 to 9,61% in 1992, 8,51% in 1991, etc. about 1% per year cited.

The impact factor was invented primarily to facilitate comparisons between journals regardless of size. Absolute citation counts favour the

Percentage	of	Total	Citations
------------	----	-------	-----------

								C	ITING	YEA	RS										
		1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1960	1981	1982	1963	1964	1945	1966	1987	1968	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
	1994																				1.55
	1993																			1.60	131
	1992																		1.03	1.38	9.99
	1991			•													144	1.04	10.12	9.98	9.50
	1990															1.60	7.47	10.21	10.13	9.01	7.43
	1989														1 74	7 48	10 12	0.40	8.43	7 33	632
	1987													1 86	171	10.23	9 58	848	7.33	6.36	5.50
	1986												1.77	7.52	10.07	9.46	8.33	7.23	6.23	5.39	4.66
	1985											1.77	7.54	10.08	9.52	8.32	7.24	6.24	5.38	4.67	4.04
С	1984										1.80	7.62	10.22	9.68	8.39	7.28	6.34	5.43	4.71	4.08	3.55
Ĩ	1983									1.88	7.65	10.32	9.62	8.45	7.29	6.33	-5.46	4.69	4.07	3.56	3.10
Ţ	1982								1.88	7.76	10.19	9.55	8.39	7.21	6.29	5.48	4.75	4.11	3.56	3.13	2.75
E	1981							1.49	7.73	10.34	9.62	8.40	7.29	6.24	5.45	4.72	4.12	3.58	3.13	2.75	2.44
U	1986						1.43	7.13	10.57	9.86	8.62	7.47	6.44	5.58	4.84	4.22	3.71	3.23	2.81	2.49	2.21
Y	1979					1.43	7.16	10.38	9.70	8,47	7.33	6.30	5.46	4.72	4.09	3.59	3.15	2.76	2.42	2.15	1.90
È	1978				1.50	7.32	10.68	9.90	851	7.33	6.33	5.45	4.73	4.09	3.56	3.13	2.75	2.41	2.12	1.88	1.67
¥.	1977			1.53	7_58	10.68	10.13	8.58	7.37	6.33	5.50	4.75	4.16	3.63	3.18	2.80	2.48	2.19	1.94	1.73	1.54
ĸ	1976		1.73	7.59	10.86	9.98	8.71	7.35	631	5.43	4.72	4.11	3.59	3.15	2.77	2.46	2.19	1.94	1.74	1.56	1.38
3	1975	1.81	8.25	11.13	10.06	8.73	7.51	6.41	5.53	4.81	4.18	3.64	3.22	2.81	2.49	2.19	1.95	1.73	1.54	1.39	1,24
	1974	8.82	11.02	10.15	8.68	1.44	0.40	3.46	4.70	4.08	3.58	3.13	2.13	2.44	2.13	1.91	1./1	1.52	1.30	1.22	1.11
	1973	11.37	10.17	8.84	7.52	0.40	3.33	4.19	4.11	1.33	3.14	213	2.44	1.00	1.92	1.14	1.04	1.38	1.43	1.11	1.01
	1972	10.21	3.64	1.00	0.40	3.31	4.01	3 63	3.02	3.10	2.19	2.40	102	1.95	1.0	1.30	1.40	1.20	1.00	0.90	0.93
	10/1	8.03	627	6.43	3.49	4.13	3.61	3.02	3.13	2.14	2.99	2.10	1.92	1.61	1.46	1 10	120	1 10	1.00	0.90	0.82
	1846	670	6.52	475	4 11	2 (0	3.01	2 10	2.01	2.30	100	1 71	1.60	1 37	1 22	1 10	100	0.90	0.82	0.71	0.61
	1948	546	475	4 16	3.69	1 10	278	249	218	1 07	171	1 54	1 39	127	1 10	1.00	0.01	0.82	0.74	0.67	0.61
	1967	472	415	1 41	3 21	2 87	2.48	2 23	1.95	1 23	1 55	1.40	1 25	1 13	1.01	0.92	0.83	0.75	0.68	0.61	0.56
	1966	3.95	3.48	3.05	2.69	2.39	2.11	1.90	1.67	1.48	1.34	1.21	1.08	0.97	0.88	0.80	0.73	0.65	0.59	0.54	0.49
	1965	3.55	3.13	2.75	2.44	2.17	1.91	1.75	1.54	1.37	1.24	1.13	1.01	0.91	0.82	0.75	0.69	0.63	0.57	0.52	0.47

Cumulative Percentage of Total Citations

CITING YEARS

								4/94	1100	1,04	000	13.00	L/MI	1144	1747	200			1115	1774
1994																				1.55
1993																			1.60	8.92
1992																		1.65	8.96	18.91
1991																	1.64	9.12	18.96	28.41
1990																1.05	9.10	19.20	28.3/	30.93
1989														1.54	0.09	9.07	19.00	28.63	37.06	44.38
1985													1 86	9.53	9.43 19.47	28.77	20.50	J/.28	50.77	56.20
1986												177	0.38	10.60	28.97	10.77	44 61	50 84	56 16	60.86
1985											177	0 31	19.46	2011	37.74	44 34	50 58	56.27	60.83	64.90
C 1984										1.80	0.10	19.61	29.15	37.50	44.52	50.68	56.28	60.93	64.91	68.45
Ĭ 1983									1.88	9.53	19.71	29.33	37.60	44.79	50.85	56.14	60.97	65.00	68.47	71.55
T 1982								1.88	9.64	19.83	29.26	37.65	44.81	51.08	56.33	60.89	65.08	68.56	71.60	74.30
E 1981							1.49	9.61	19.98	29.60	37.66	44.95	51.04	56.53	61.05	65.01	68.66	71.69	74.35	76.74
^D 1980	1					1.43	8.62	20.18	29.84	38.46	45.13	45.01	56.62	61.36	65. 28	68.72	71.90	74.50	76.84	78.95
Y 1979					1.43	8.59	19.00	29.88	38.31	45.64	\$1.43	51.45	61.34	65.45	68.87	71.88	74.65	76.92	78.99	80.85
Ē 1978	1			1.50	8.75	19.27	28.90	38.39	45.64	51.97	56.88	56.92	65.43	69.01	72.00	74.63	77.06	79.04	80.87	82.52
<u>A</u> 1977	1		1.53	9.08	19.43	29.40	37.48	45.76	51.97	\$7.47	61.63	61.64	69.06	72.18	74.80	77.11	79.25	80.98	\$2.60	\$4.06
K 1976		1.73	9.12	19.94	29.41	38.11	44.83	52.07	57.40	62.12	65.74	65.80	72.20	74.95	77.26	79.30	81.19	82.72	84.16	85.44
5 1975	1.81	9.98	20.25	30.00	38.14	45.62	51.24	57.60	62.21	66.93	69.38	69.40	75.02	77.43	79.45	81.25	82.93	84.26	85.55	80.08
1974	10.63	21.00	30.40	38.68	45.85	\$2.02	56.72	62.30	66.29	70.47	72.51	72.61	77,46	79.58	81.37	82.90	64.43	83.62	80.77	87.79
113	22.00	31.17	39.24	40.20	52.04	5/.33	01.31	00.41	11 00	13.44	13.40	13.31	19.02	81.30	83.09	94.20	63.64	60.63	87.88	88.80
19/2	32.21	40.01	40.54	32.00	57.01	04.30	63.70	70.03	13.00	70.14	70.00	11.01	61.37	83.24	84.00 84.00	83.90	87.00	87.59 99.00	66.91 90.90	89.73
1971	40.80	4/.44	33.29	20.12	64.57	70.00	207.32	75.10	78.74	90.69	17.00	81.02	84.60	86.92	87 14	11 14	10.10	80.37 10.00	67.6V 00.70	90.33
1960	54.48	59 21	63.53	67 82	70.00	71 22	75 34	78 41	80.40	17 61	11 50	1171	\$6.26	87.44	18 44	2011	90.10	90.81	01 41	92.05
1961	59.95	63.96	67.69	70.64	73.28	76.00	77.83	80.59	82.32	M.24	85.13	15.25	\$7.49	88.55	89.44	90.24	91.01	91.55	92.10	92.66
1967	64.66	68.11	71.32	73.85	76.10	78.48	80.06	82.54	\$4.05	\$5.78	\$6.53	16.63	18.62	19.56	90.36	91.07	91.76	92.23	92.71	93.22
1966	68.61	71.59	74.37	76.54	78.49	80.59	11.96	84.21	85.53	87.08	87.74	87.88	88.59	90.44	91.16	91.80	92.41	92.82	93.25	93.71
1965	72.16	74.72	77.12	78.98	80.66	82.50	83.71	\$5.75	86.90	88.14	88.87	88.96	90.50	91.26	91.90	92.48	93.04	93.39	93.77	94.18

Table 2. Science Citation Index[®] 1975-94. Chronological distribution of citations to authored items (non-patents). Citation data for citing years earlier than 1975 and for cited years earlier than 1965 are available in editions of the *SCI*[®] published prior to 1989.

Reference Year	% Total	Cumulative %
1994	1.55	1.55
1993	7.37	8.92
1992	9.99	18.91
1991	9.50	28.41
1990	8.54	36.95
1989	7.43	44.38
1988	6.32	50.70

Table 3. Science Citation Index[®] 1994. Chronological distribution of citations to authored items (non-patents).

largest journals whether in current output or in cumulative output over the past century. Thus even a defunct journal might receive more citations than an existing one. For many years the *Journal of Agricultural Research* which ceased publication about 1950, was cited more than other living journals.

Table 4 shows a ranked list of journals in the 1993 Journal Citation Reports arranged by total citations to all years. Deceased journals are omitted. This ranking does not discriminate between journals on the basis of age or size. Current productivity or output is also an important indicator of a journal's influence. Table 5 shows the top 50 journals in terms of items processed for the 1993 SCI – all published over 950 articles per year.

This is a good place to show another version of these data. Figure 1



Figure 1. Distribution of published items and citations among science journals, 1989 SCI.

RANK	JOURNAL TITLE	ALL YEARS	10NS IN 1992	1993 T 1991	92+91
1	P NATL ACAD SCI USA	234319	_31312 .	29115	50425
5	NATURE	226827	21628	23806	15134
ž	SCIENCE	170514	-17565 ·	-21328	-332/65
2	CF11	113325	-14277.	-1941 <u>9</u>	
Ž	PHYS REV B	106320	12214	13350	
8	J CHEM PHYS	103263	12619	14011	26630
10	NEW ENGL J MED			-10085	-17384
11		78615	6761 -	-10061	16822
13	BIOCHEMISTRY-US	76131	7529	9146	16675
14	AM J PHYSIOL	71574			
16	BRAIN RES-	61842			
jŽ	CANCER RES	<u>60626</u>		6183	
18	ASTROPHYS J	57088	5128	<u>6018</u>	11199
ŻÓ	J CELL BIOL			67/1	
31	BIOCHEM BIOPH RES CO			6750	-11336
23	NUCLEIC ACIDS RES	52218	4187	-7158	-13842
35	L APPI PHYS	48376	3076	5782	8 858
26	J GEOPHYS RES				7643
27	APPL PHYS LETT			4781	
29	CIRCULATION	47233	4274	6452	10676
30	BIOCHEM J			5984	10676
32	BLOOD	44029		7770	
<u>3</u> 3	TETRAHEDRON LETT				
35	J BACTERIOL	40320	4183	4632	8815
36	ANAL BIOCHEM		3335		-6601
38	ENDOCRINOLOGY				7682
39	PHYS REV A	58125	4013		
40 21	JAMA-J AM MED ASSOC	37230	3231	3665	6896
42	FEBS LETT				10659
22	BRIT MED J	35904 -		-2699	
45	JVIROL		4968		10750
- 49		32493	2095	2475	4570
48	CHEM PHYS LETT			-3927	7810
49	ANAL CHEM				6037
31	ANN INTERN MED	29871	2310	2729	5039
50			1214		
35	GASTROENTEROLOGY	28229	2770	2764	5534
52	J PHARMACOL EXP THE	RZ8878 -	2075	2948	5025

Table 4. 1993 Citations to all years. Journals ranked by Times Cited in 1993.

demonstrates how a relatively small group of journals dominates scientific publication. I called this the Law of Concentration in contrast to Bradford's Law of Scattering. The dashed line shows that 100 journals produce 20% of the articles published. The solid line shows that 100 journals receive 42% of the citations.

RANK	JOURNAL TITLE	.IMPACT FACTOR	CITATIONS IN 1993 TO 1993 ITEMS	SOURCE ITEMS IN 1993	IMMEDIACY INDEX
1	PHYS REV B	3. <u>159</u>	2672	4770	0.560
- G	J BIOL CHEM	0.793 -			1.966
2	D NATI ACAN SCI USA	10 325 -		2661	0.305
5	AM J PHYSIOL	3.139	872	2351	0.371
6`	APPL PHYS LETT	3.503 -	1105		0.482
7	J AM CHEM SOC	·· 5.365	2061	2276	0,905
ğ	PHYS REV LETT				
10	TETRAHEDRON LETT	2:258 -	1043	5182 -	0.788
iĭ	JPN J APPL PHYS	1.348	424	2060	Ŏ.2Ŏ6
12	J PHYS CHEM-US	3.395 -	1252		0.626
13	BIOCHIM BIOPHYS ACTA	£•484	221	1890	0.292
14	I GEODUYS DES		1091		0.202
16	BIOCHEMISTRY-US	5.109 -			0.859
17	BRAIN RES	2.854	461	1658	0,278
18	BIOCHEM BIOPH RES CO		510		0.312
19	PHYS LEII B				0.620
51	FFRS IFTT	3.339	681	1509	0.451
Ż	TRANSPLANT P				0.226
23	J ORG CHEM	3.235	805	1334	0.603
24	PHYS REV D				0.857
22	A LITTUNUL	1 157 -			0.266
57	PHYS REV A	2.271	714	1277	0.559
28	ELECTRON LETT				0.297
29	PHYS REV E		4/5	1193	0.3%
<u>50</u> 71		2.807 -		1121	
32	NUCLEIC ACIDS RES		657	1104	0.595
33	EUR J PHARMACOL	2.849	367	1093	0.336
34	SYNTHETIC MET				0.453
22	NULL INSTRUM METH A				0.382
37	I BACTERIOI	3.965	819	1063	0.770
38	BIOCHEM J		638		0.608
39	ANN NY ACAD SCI	9.850	229	1047	0.219
40	J CHEM SOC CHEM COM	21 07/	/ 201		
41	I DUVS-CONDENS MAT			-1020	
23	CANCER RES	6.011	ŠŎŠ	1015	0.796
44	PHYS LETT A				0.294
45	ASTRON ASTROPHYS		121	228	2.121
49	NATURE DUYS B			670	
28	PHYTOCHEMISTRY	1.102			0.148
Zğ	J MATER SCI	0.765	155	<u> </u>	ð.160
ŠÓ	J VIROL		914		0.958

Table 5. SCI Journal citation reports. Journals ranked by source items in 1993.

ity. It is a preliminary indicator of influence. However, there are some journals which achieve a remarkably high impact in spite of, or maybe even because of, their size. Thus, one might reasonably argue for a combined measure reflecting size, citation and currency.

That is illustrated in Table 6 which shows the journals most-cited in 1993 for their 1991 and 1992 articles. Undoubtedly this tells us something

6

		LIIALIONS			
P/NK	JOURNAL TITLE	IN 1993 TO	<source it<="" th=""/> <th>MS in-></th> <th>IMPACT</th>	MS in->	IMPACT
		92+91	1992 1991	92+91	FACTOR
~					
-					
1	J BIOL CHEM	51535	3891 3695	7586	6.793
2	P NATL ACAD SCI USA		25022582		-10.325
3	NATURE	45434	1033 1002	2035	ZZ.326
4.	ŞÇIENCE	32072			-21.074
5	CELL	33626	452 474	_209	57.192
Ę.	PHYS REV LETT	26659			
	PHYS REV B	\$2284	4178 2872	8023	3.755
Š.	J AN CHEN SUC				
-7	NEW ENGL J MEU	1/235			
14	DIOCUENICTEV-LIC	12675	-1292 -1888		
45	BIUCHERISIRT-US	122/2			
19		17887	205/ 20/1	4,005	
17					
12	AN I DUVSTON	12.62.3			
12		13925	<u> </u>		
17	5000 V	12202	813 791	1637	Å 120
18	CANCER RES-	13062			6.011
iğ	HOL CELL BIOL	13311	610 713	1323	9.230
ŻÓ	J CELL BIOL	12004	521505		-11.700
21	J PHYS CHEM-US	11935	1784 1731	3515	3.395
ŽŻ	BIOCHEM BIOPH RES CO-	11346			
23	ASTROPHYS J	11196	1680 1626	3306	3. 387
24	NUCLEIC ACIDS RES				
25	J VIROL	10730	967 933	1900	5.647
26	CIRCULATION				
26	J EXP MED	106/6	411 397	- (50	13-05(
<u>28</u>	PHYS LETT B		-1(2) - 1(2)		
- 29	J CLIN INVEST	10023			3.712
20	BIOCHIM BIOPHIS ACIA-			2058	5.371
21.	PHYS REV A				-5.85
35	TETANENDONI LETT	8000	2039 1047	1086	5.268
37		8666	13261610		
		8858	1963 3003	4966	1.784
えん	I RACTERIO	8815			
ŤŽ	FFBS I FTT	8686	.1360 1241	2601	- 3.339
38	BIOCHEM J	7881			-3.659
<u>3</u> 9	CHEM PHYS LETT	7810	1359 1229	2588	3.018
Z Ó	ENDOCRINOLOGY	<u>7682</u>			-4.256
41	J GÉÓPHYS RES	7643	1510 1680		2.326
42	NEURON	6954			-17.256
43	JAMA-J_AM MED ASSOC	6896	. 588 644	7735	2.597
44	GENE DEV				-12.442
45	J MOL BIOL	-9001	844 2218		3.425
46	PHYSICA C	277			
47	PHYS REV D		<u> </u>	<u>~~783 ··</u>	
- 78	J NEURUSUI	6200	1138 1071	2208	2.202
27					
ξĭ	NICL DUYS R	÷ 6014	711 815	1326 -	2.535
14	NUL THIS U				
52	SIRF SCI-	5748		2178	2.639
٤٤	FUR I PHARMACOL	5730	1046 965	2011	2.849
ξŽ	FASER J				-16.634
27		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•	

Table 6. SCI Journal citation reports. Journals rankings 1993. Ranked by time 1991 and 1992 items were cited in 1993.

about their overall current influence. However, it is important to mention that there are differences between fields as to the rate at which knowledge is accumulated. But surprisingly even a field like astrophysics has a cited half-life less than 10 years, as is also the case for plant science journals. While a journal like *Cell* has a cited half-life of four years, it would require more study to say anything authoritative. The new CD-ROM version of

JCR will allow this to be done more easily.

If you compare Table 6 to Table 4 you can see how the rankings change. *JBC* moves to 1st place and *PNAS* moves to 2nd. *Nature* moves from 46th place to 3rd and *Science* moves from 41st to 4th.

I much regret that ISI did not originally publish long-term cumulative factors in the *Journal Citation Reports*. However, the urgencies of meeting annual schedules and the lower priority it received as a give-away product discouraged this from happening. As I often demonstrated in *Current Contents* essays, you can easily combine data for consecutive issue of *JCR* to obtain such information.

Keep in mind, however, that a five -or ten - year impact number can be calculated in two ways. The first is to use one base year as a baseline and create a moving five-year window. The other is to use several base years and include all citations for the same base years. The latter would generally produce a lower value, but not always. For example, *JAMA* published 627 articles in 1989 (see Equation 2). In the five years 1989-93, it received 11,320 citations. This gives a five-year impact of 18.05. It published 3,101 articles from 1989 to 1993 and received 29,047 citations in those five years

1989-93 Citations to 1989 Articles	11,320 +
1989 Articles	627
Five-Year Impact	18.05
Five-years window	
1989-93 Citations to 1989-93 Articles	29,407 +
1989-93 Articles published	3,101
Five-Year Impact	9.37

Equation 2. Five-year impact for Jama.

or a five-year impact of 9.37. This gives you a preliminary idea of the possible differences in current and cumulative impact.

The following Equation 3, I've done the same exercise for Nature and

Science. The current year impact and the most recent five-year impact, however, do not give us an absolute picture of the long-term performance of journals. And as we will see, there turns out to be considerable variance from year-to-year depending upon whether the journal published one or more super-cited articles.



As editors you know that it is not always easy to categorize or character-

Equation 3. Five-year impact for Nature and Science.

ize different types of editorial matter. Not all review articles are labelled as such and many reviews contain original research data as well. Such hybrids are also to be observed in characterizing letters to the editor, which vary considerably in quality and scope. That is why I have always urged editors to conduct an item-by-item citation audit. These audits may or may not confirm your own subjective estimate of the best quality articles - or the most innovative or the most premature. But they will give you some objective indicators of the way they have influenced your readers and the scientific community. Let me turn now to the presentation of my main slides. With the advent of the ISI Journal Performance Indicators databases, I realized that it would be relatively easy to obtain long- term measures of impact. These had never before been published. In the next tables I've compiled such cumulative data for the single year 1981 as well as for the five-year period 1981-5.

Table 7 shows the top 34 research journals ranked by current impact

Table 7 shows the top 34 research journals ranked by current impact factor for 1993. Later, I'll show you data for review journals. The rank by current impact is shown on the left followed by the cumulative impact for 1981 articles followed in turn by a number showing the rank by cumulative impact. Lest the folks at *Cell* jump to any conclusions, let me point out that about 20% of their articles are classified as reviews. So it would be reasonable to separate these two classes of articles in a deeper analysis.

1993 Rank	Journal	1993 Impect	1981 Av/Cites 1961-93	1981 Cum Rank
1.	Cell	37.2	125.5	1
2.	NEJM	23.8	115.8	· 2
3.	Nature	22.3	70.5	8
4.	Science	21.1	61.1	10
5.	Lancet	15.9	51.6	17
6.	J Exp Med	13.7	89.3	3
7.	J Cell Biol	11.7	80.7	5
8.	PNAS (Bioi)	10.3	85.9	4
9.	Arch Gen Psych	9.5	78.8	6
10.	Ann Int Med	9.3	53.7	15
11.	Am J Hum Genet	9.2	24.3	31
12.	Moi Celi Bioi	9.2	46.8	20
13.	Circulation	9.0	54.3	13
14.	CA Cancer J	8.9	10.3	34
15.	J Clin Invest	8.5	77.1	7
16.	Blood	8.1	52.7	16
17.	J Neurosci	8.0	70.1	9
18.	J Nati Canc I	7.5	30.5	29
19.	Phys Rev L	7.1	43.0	21
20.	Jimmunol	7.1	55.0	12
21.		7.0	35.5	26
22.	Syst 2001	6.8	42.8	22
23.	JBC	6.8	48.7	18
24.	Angew Chem	6.2	21.0	32
25.		6.0	36.7	25
20.		5.9	47.4	19
21.		5.8	54.1	14
28.		5.7	60.7	11
29.	J Virology	5./ # 7	32.2	28
30.	AIT J Pauloi	5./	42.2	23
31.		5.5	20.7	33
32.		5.6	41.9	24
33.	Artonitis Mileum	5.5	27.3	30
34.		5.5	35.6	27

Table 7. Current vs cumulative impact

In Table 8, I've shown these 34 journals ranked by the cumulative impact number for their 1981 articles. In the second column, the current 1993 impact is shown. As you can see, the order is quite different. While *Cell* and NEJM are the first two listed in both columns, Journal of Experimental Medicine moves from 7th to 3rd, PNAS moves from 9th to 4th, and Journal of Cell Biology moves from 6th to 5th. Archives of General Psychiatry moves from 9th to 6th. Considering that this is a behavioral science journal, it is all the more remarkable and may say something about its shift to neuroscience. The change in rank for Nature and Science is significant as are the rankings for many of the other titles.

Joi	umai	1981 Articles Av Cum Cites 1981-93	1993 Impact Factor	1981-6 Articles Av Cum Impact 1981-03
1.	Cell	125.5	37.2	140.0
2.	NEJM	115.8	23.8	107.8
3.	JExp Med	89.3	13.7	82.2
4.	PNAS (Bio!)	85.9	10.3	74.0
5.	J Cell Biol	80.7	11.7	66.5
6.	Arch Gen Psych	78.8	9.5	69.3
7.	J Clin invest	77.1	8.5	64.0
8.	Nature	70.5	22.3	87.5
9.	J Neurosci	70.1	8.0	52.6
10.	Science	61.1	21.1	79.2
11.	J Moi Bioi	60.7	5.7	55.7
12.	J Immunol	55.0	7.1	47.1
13.	Circulation	54.3	9.0	46.9
14.	Circulation Res	54.1	5.8	58.5
15.	Ann Int Med	53.7	9.3	54.1
16.	Blood	52.7	8.1	45.7
17.	Lancet	51.6	15.9	47.6
18.	JBC	48.7	6.8	47.7
19.	Gastroenterology	47.4	5.9	39.3
20.	Mol Cell Biol	46.8	9.2	50.6
21.	Phys Rev L	43.0	7.1	40.5
22.	Syst Zool	42.8	6.8	26.7
23.	Am J Pathol	42.2	5.7	34.9
24.	Eur J Immunol	41.9	5.6	32.1
25.	Cancer Res	36.7	6.0	33.4
26.	Ann Neurol	36.6	7.0	36.6
27,	Lab Invest	35.6	5.5	41.9
28.	J Virology	32.2	5.7	32.4
29.	J Nati Canc I	30.6	7.5	22.4
30.	Arthritis Rheum	27.3	5.5	27.0
31.	Am J Hum Genet	24.3	9.2	24.3
32.	Angew Chem	21.0	6.2	21.9
33.				
	JAMA	20.7	5.6	22.2

Table 8. Current vs current impact factor

It is important to note, however, that a single year does not tell the whole story. In the last column is shown the cumulative impact for 1981-6 articles. Remarkably, for some journals this goes up rather than down, see e.g. *Nature, Science, Circulation Research, and Annals of Internal Medicine.* The Table 9 covers another aspect of journalology that has distressed me since the publication of David Hamilton's ill conceived diatribe in Science in which he mischievously misquoted data he did not understand concerning citedness in science and the humanities. As you can see from these data, the journals that produce the highest impact articles have an extremely low degree of uncitedness. Even this, by itself, does not say enough be-

Journal	# Items	1981 Articles Av Cum Cites 1981-93 (All)	1981 Cited Items (Cited)	1981 % Uncited	1981 Total Cites
1. Cell	393	125.5	125.5	0.00	49,307
2. NEJM	378	115.8	117.1	1.06	43,784
3. J Exp Med	343	89.3	89.6	0.29	30,630
4. PNAS (Bioi)	1550	85.9	86.0	0.13	133,135
5. J Cell Blol	367	80.7	80.7	0.00	29,629
6. Arch Gen Psy	/ch 152	78.8	79.8	1.31	11,970
7. J Clin Invest	418	77.1	77.5	0.48	32,226
8. Nature	1375	70.5	72.5	2.76	96,881
9. J Neurosci	106	70.1	70.1	0.00	7,432
10. Science	1077	61.1	63.9	4.36	65,831
11. J Mol Biol	307	60.7	61.3	0.99	18,629
12. J Immunol	989	55.0	55.1	0.20	54,380
13. Circulation	416	54.3	55.4	1.92	22,601
14. Circulation R	les 267	54.1	54.1	0.00	14,439
15. Ann Int Med	290	53.7	54.9	2.10	15,528
16. Blood	360	52.7	52.7	0.00	18,983
17. Lancet	641	51.6	69.3	25.60	33056
18. JBC	2220	48.7	49.0	0.59	108,107
19. Gastroentero	ology 325	47.4	48.0	1.23	15,408
20. Mol Cell Biol	122	46.8	47.2	0.81	5,713
21. Phys Rev L	992	43.0	43.2	0.40	42,463
22. Syst Zool	34	42.8	44.1	2.86	1,455
23. AM J Pathol	167	42.2	42.8	1.19	7,053
24. Eur J Immun	IOI 171	41.9	42.9	2.33	7,156
25. Gancer Hes	851	36.7	36.9	0.59	31,245
20. ANN NOULO	222	30.0	37.6	2.69	8,131
	139	35.8	35.9	0.71	4,952
20. J VIRDIOGY	483	32.2	32.5	0.83	15,558
	I 300	30.6	30.8	0.65	9375
	um 204	27.3	28.0	2.44	5,577
JI. AM J HUM G		24.3	24.5	1.27	1,896
JZ. ANGEW CHEN	n 413	21.0	21.6	2.66	8,664
33. JAMA	551	20.7	22.8	9.20	11,382
34. CA Cancer J	36	10.3	1 3.8	24.32	372

Table 9. Cumulative impact and uncitedness. 1981 articles cited 1981-93

cause we need to study the meaning of uncitedness. Many articles may be cited only one or two times because their content is superseded by subsequent papers reporting on studies conducted over a long period of time. That also should be the subject of a separate investigation. This is a good way to segue into Table 10 covering review journals. As you can see, *Annual Review of Biochemistry* achieves an impact of over 320 for the 188 articles it published from 1981-86.

COUNTRY	6yr avg	SumOfCITATIONS	SumOfSOURCES
ANN R BIOCH	320.31	60219	188
ANN R CELL	231.35	7866	34
ADV PROTEIN	205.29	4311	21
ANN R IMMUN	194.59	16929	87
PHYSIOL REV	176.53	22066	125
REV M PHYS	167.85	21821	130
ADV IMMUNOL	159.19	6686	42
MICROBIOL R	145.28	18015	124
ANN R NEUR	141.60	13877	98
PHARM REV	138.26	10646	77
ANN R PLANT	138.22	17139	124
ANN R GENET	131.99	13199	100
ENDOCR REV	128.49	17731	138
ADV PHYSICS	108.93	6318	58
ANN R PHARM	107.59	15493	144
ADV CARB C	96.80	3388	35
ANN R ASTRO	94.43	8782	93
ADV ORGMET	90.62	3534	39
CHEM REV	90.54	13853	153
BRAIN RES R	89.74	9602	107
ANN R PH CH	85.64	10277	120
IMMUNOL REV	80.12	22753	284
Q REV BIOPH	77.37	3946	51
REV PHYS B	76.94	3847	50
ANN R PHYSL	75.35	20722	275
PROG NUCL	74.16	2373	32
PSYCHOL REV	73.71	11646	158
CRC C R BI	72.47	7754	107
ANN R ECOL	70.42	8239	117
REC PROG H	70.05	4273	61
ANN R MICRO	68.73	9829	143
ACC CHEM RE	68.44	23887	349
ANN R BIOPH	65.31	7184	110
ADV ENZYM	56.98	2963	52
EPIDEMIOL R	53.32	3039	57
PHYS REPORT	52.06	24259	466
PROG NEUROB	50.34	5789	115

Table 10. Cumulative impact 1981-94. review journal articles published 1981-6

•	Year	Cumulative Impact	
	1981	328.65	
	1982	251.03	
	1983	391.28	
	1984	369.95	
	1985	311.64	
	1986	299.68	
	1987	519.93	

The variation from year to year is substantial as shown in Table 11:

Table 11. Annual Review of Biochemistry year-by-year cumulative impact. Note the huge increase for 1987

Let me remind you that there are many other details which must be taken into consideration. E.g. journals which appear in translation may receive credit for more citations than they deserve since both the original and the translation may be cited simultaneously. We cannot easily unscrambled these data although Braun et al. did so recently for the *Angewandte Chemie* in the new journal *Chemical Intelligencer*.

Journal	6-Year	Current	
	Impact Ranking	Impact Ra	nking
Lancet	70	18	
Circulation Research	51	100	
Brain Research	210	338	

Table 12. Current rankings vs cumulative rankings

In final Table 12, I've assembled some data on three journals to illustrate how rankings change up or down based on current versus cumulative rankings. I hope that all of these data have justified my title - the impact of cumulative impact.