

Information Retrieval for R&D support

Gennady Osipov, Ivan Smirnov, Ilya Tikhomirov, Ilya Sochenkov, Artem Shelmanov, and Alexander Shvets

Institute for Systems Analysis of Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia
`{gos,ivs,tih,sochenkov,shelmanov,shvets}@isa.ru`

Abstract. Research and development (R&D) involves not only researchers but also many other specialists from different areas. All of them solve a variety of tasks that require comprehensive information and analytical support. This chapter discusses the major tasks arising in R&D: study of the state of the art in a given research area, prospects assessment of research fields and forecasting their development, quality assessment of scientific publications including plagiarism detection, and automated examination of proposed R&D projects. A number of informational and analytical systems have been developed to address these tasks. The main goal of this chapter is to give a review of R&D support functions of well-known and widely-used search and analytical systems and discuss information retrieval methods behind these functions.

Keywords: full-text search, information retrieval, R&D support, scientific publication, citation databases, scientometrics, exploratory search

1 Introduction

Research and development (R&D) activities involve many kinds of specialists: researchers, analysts of companies interested in R&D, experts of venture capital funds, state authorities responsible for policy in science and technology. All of these specialists demand comprehensive information and analytical support to solve many different tasks arising in R&D.

One of a researcher's main needs is to study publications from reliable and authoritative sources in a given research area. This task is primarily related to specific professional information search in large-scale collections of scientific documents: papers, journals, reports, conference proceedings, patents, etc.

Venture capital funds look for the most promising innovative projects that can pay off in the near future. Analysts of these funds need to understand which research areas are developing and which are prone to stagnation. Before making decision on funding, they need to make a forecast about development of research areas, examine, and select the most promising projects.

When an R&D project is finished, the problem of evaluating its results arises. Sponsors need to assess results and make a decision about whether to fund further research. This problem is commonly related to the examination of reports and publications of the research team produced during the project.

As a result, the diversity and increasing amount of available scientific and technological (sci-tech) information as well as the specificity of the tasks of R&D induce the development of one of the contemporary branches in information retrieval – professional search and analytical processing of scientific information. Many methods and automated tools have been specially developed to process sci-tech information.

This chapter discusses the major tasks arising in R&D. It gathers and reviews information about many mature and emerging technologies, systems, resources, and approaches that are useful for solving these tasks. The chapter also suggests approaches for processing sci-tech information that can be useful for creating next generation search and analytical systems for R&D support, which is one of the main goals of the MUMIA Action.

The rest of the chapter is structured as follows. Section 2 is devoted to the problem of studying of the state of research in a given research area. Section 3 introduces systems and methods for the prospective assessment of research fields and forecasting their development. Section 4 examines techniques for the qualitative assessment of scientific publications. Section 5 discusses the problem of the expert review of proposed R&D projects. Section 6 concludes the chapter.

2 Study of a research area

One of the main needs of those involved in R&D is information about the state of the art in different research areas. Modern scientific and technological progress is based on the latest results achieved by researchers and scientists in different institutions all around the world. The results of R&D are published in scientific journals, conference proceedings, books, PhD theses, technical reports, patent descriptions, etc. One needs to survey and discover these sources to choose the right research goals, use modern technologies and methods, and achieve top-level results.

2.1 Tasks behind study of a research area

Every scientific project starts with the exploration of the area of research. A researcher must find the latest information about the problem and modern solutions to determine the direction of research. During research, one should familiarize oneself with the latest tendencies in the area and with the results achieved by other research groups. Continuous study of the research area helps project leaders to guide the research in the right direction. It is also helpful when evaluating the results of a project and comparing them with the state of the art in the area of research. Developers of scientific projects as well as patent attorneys, and Patent Office experts also require complete information about the latest results, inventions, and technologies in particular research areas to fulfill their professional needs. Thus, the study of a research area is an integral part of all R&D activities.

Study a research area comprises the following tasks.

The first task is *information search*. A user needs to find answers to questions, particular facts, or documents, which they know are characterized by keywords, key phrases, and some metadata.

The second task is *exploratory search* [1]. It assumes that a user needs information about a topic or a particular problem in a research area, but they are unfamiliar with the domain of their goals (i.e. the user needs to learn about the topic in order to understand how to achieve their goal) or unsure about ways to achieve their goals [2].

The third task is *fast familiarization* with the topic and the content of a particular document in the focus of a user's attention. This can be achieved by presenting keywords and abstracts of documents, which are provided by authors as metadata or built automatically using methods for keyword extraction and text summarization.

2.2 Scientific analytical systems to support study of a research area

In the modern world, the full and comprehensive study of a research area cannot be performed without search and analytical systems. The common way to find required information is to use a global web search engine like Google, Bing, Yahoo, or Yandex. Although these systems provide advanced capabilities for information search on the Web, they cannot satisfy information needs arising from R&D activities and cannot solve the tasks mentioned above. The reasons for this are the following:

- Functionalities of the global search engines are *limited to the keyword search*;
- The global search engines focus on requests that are *limited to a short phrase*;
- The global search engines suffer from *low precision* due to large numbers of irrelevant documents among search results, such as advertisements, paper descriptions, and announcements, which clog up information returned to users;
- The global search engines have a *low recall* due to an incomplete coverage of specific information sources such as scientific journals, patent databases, etc.

To solve the tasks of the study of a research area, the following scientific analytical systems were developed: digital scientific libraries, patent databases and search engines, academic search engines, and scientific citation indexing services and databases. They provide a varied set of scientific search and analytical functions. Table 1 gives succinct overview of these systems.

Digital scientific libraries specialize in particular scientific fields and provide extended search functionality including paper metadata indexing, predefined taxonomies for document topic identification, thesauri for query expansion, and specific user interfaces for complex query construction.

Patent databases are mostly similar to digital scientific libraries but have extended metadata sets and cover all scientific and technical fields. Therefore,

Table 1. Scientific analytical systems

Category	System	Comment
Digital scientific libraries	ArXiv ^[1]	Contains e-prints in physics, mathematics, computer science
	PubMed ^[2]	Contains papers on life sciences and biomedical topics
	IEEE Xplore ^[3]	Contains scientific and technical content published by the IEEE
	NGC ^[4]	Contains evidence-based clinical practice guidelines in medicine
Patent databases	European Patent Organisation (EPO) ^[5] , The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) ^[6] , Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS) ^[7]	Contain patents and patent application topically classified by experts
Patent search engines	Google Patents ^[8] , FPO ^[9]	Aggregate data from different patent databases
Academic search engines	Scirus ^[10] , CiteSeer ^{X[11]} , Google Scholar ^[12] [3], Microsoft Academic Search ^[13] , Exactus Expert ^[14] [4]	Aggregate scientific semi-structured data from the Web
Scientific citation indexing services and databases	Elsevier Scopus ^[15] , Thomson Reuters Web of Science (WoS) ^[16] , eLIBRARY.RU ^[17]	Import structured bibliographic data from publisher databases and scientific journals

[1] <http://arxiv.org/>[2] <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/>[3] <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/>[4] <http://www.guideline.gov/>[5] <http://www.epo.org/>[6] <http://www.uspto.gov/>[7] http://www1.fips.ru/wps/wcm/connect/content_en/en/main/[8] <https://www.google.com/?tbs=pts>[9] <http://www.freepatentsonline.com/>[10] <http://www.scirus.com/>[11] <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu>[12] <http://scholar.google.com>[13] <http://academic.research.microsoft.com/>[14] <http://expert.exactus.ru/>[15] <http://www.scopus.com/>[16] <http://thomsonreuters.com/web-of-science-core-collection/>[17] <http://elibrary.ru>

patent databases use complex hierarchical taxonomies, such as the International Patent Classification (IPC)^[18] or the Cooperative Patent Classification (CPC)^[19] to specify the category of an invention presented in a patent. There are patent search engines that automatically aggregate data from different patent databases.

Academic search engines aggregate scientific information from different sources including web sites of scientific journals, publisher databases, and digital libraries. The *scientific citation indexing services and databases* also focus on scientific information and provide advanced metadata analysis features (e.g., bibliographic reference analysis).

CiteSeer^X, Google Scholar, and Exactus Expert focus on indexing scientific information that is freely published on the Web. The considered academic search engines extract descriptive metadata of scientific documents (e.g., titles, authors, affiliations, etc.) directly from their entire texts. For example, Google Scholar uses information extraction algorithms, which take into account information about fonts and layout of a text^[20]. Descriptive metadata extracted from documents without markup (PDF, PS, etc.) often contains some errors. Therefore, some systems (e.g., Google Scholar and Exactus Expert) extract descriptive metadata not only from the texts of target documents, but also from web pages containing paper descriptions or tables of contents. The extracted metadata is linked with the corresponding full-text documents.

Automated web-crawling, indexing, and metadata extraction often produce inconsistent data due to different citation formats, different spellings of authors' surnames, misspellings, full-text duplicates, and other difficulties. Thus, the tasks of author disambiguation [5,6], bibliographic reference identification [7,8,9], and duplicate documents filtering arise.

Digital scientific libraries and patent databases use quite a different approach to update their databases. The editors and administrators of these systems store the full texts of scientific documents to repositories with descriptive and bibliographic metadata along with structured bibliographic references manually. Most of digital scientific libraries export structured bibliographic metadata and bibliographic references to citation indexing services and databases. Thus, data inconsistency rarely arises with such an approach, and the main challenges lie in complexity of manual updates and full-text indexing.

[18] International Patent Classification. Available at: <http://www.wipo.int/classifications/ipc/en/>, last accessed July 5, 2014.

[19] Cooperative Patent Classification. Available at: <http://www.cooperativepatentclassification.org/index.html;jsessionid=1ujqr7669rr4i>, last accessed July 5, 2014.

[20] Inclusion Guidelines for Webmasters. Available at: <http://scholar.google.com/intl/en/scholar/inclusion.html>, last accessed July 5, 2014.

2.3 Information search in scientific analytical systems

Although all of the aforementioned systems support search through metadata as the main entry point to system databases, not all of them provide full-text search. Web of Science and Scopus do not work with semi-structured full-text data at all, but focus on processing of bibliographical data aggregated from scientific journals and publisher databases. Microsoft Academic Search and eLIBRARY.RU support limited text search through abstracts and descriptions of scientific documents.

Patent databases, digital scientific libraries, and the mentioned academic search engines provide *full-text search* along with advanced search capabilities. In general, these systems support the *Boolean query language*, implement different methods for ranking search results by relevance, and provide the ability to precisely specify search areas (e.g., by bibliographic metadata constraints).

Digital scientific libraries and academic search engines work with search queries in natural language. The information search functions of these systems use inverted indices [10] and provide complex relevance ranking of search results along with the extended Boolean model [11]. Google Scholar considers citation counts and words included in the title of a document^[21] [12]. Exactus Expert uses the complex text comparison algorithm [13], which combines statistical features of words (like TF-IDF or BM ranking [14,15] used in most of search engines) with linguistic features of a query and indexed texts [16].

CiteSeer^X [17] and Exactus Expert process full texts of scientific papers to extract bibliographic references and provide the ability to search through citations.

2.4 Exploratory search in scientific analytical systems

Search and analytical systems can help to solve this task in several ways. The first one is to use the *topic identification* methods to assign documents to categories and restrict search to particular categories. The second way is to use *thesauri for query expansion* [18] with conventional domain-specific lexis, which helps to find documents that belong to the user's area of interest. The third way is to *recommend search requests* similar to the original one [19]. The fourth way is to implement the search for *documents that are thematically similar* to the set of documents specified by a user.

Aforementioned scientific analytical systems usually do not utilize automatic methods for topic identification. It is mostly performed by editors and administrators or by the authors of papers using a predefined *taxonomy*. Documents corresponding to each topic can be accessed by navigating through the taxonomy, which is another access point to the search and analytical database [20].

Digital libraries containing materials on a particular research area offer the taxonomy related to that area. For example, ArXiv has a one-level hierarchy

[21] How does Google Scholar work? Available at: <https://www.lib.umn.edu/faq/5342>, last accessed July 5, 2014.

structure for each research area, which is convenient to explore. Users can select the particular category and get a list of recent documents to discover the latest published results. Users can also perform keyword search inside the chosen category.

Patent databases offer Boolean search as the main information search tool. Search results are sorted by date or patent / application number. Using this approach, selection of relevant patents from the desired research area is a complicated task because of a huge number of search results. One should specify all keywords that characterize the desired domain along with the particular IPC categories. If a user wants to find all patents / applications thematically similar to the particular one, they must make an assumption about the keywords and construct an appropriate search query [21].

Some practical problems arise in the case of *global taxonomies* presenting a structure of all research areas. Because of the large multi-level hierarchy of such taxonomies, it is impossible to keep in mind all categories. Therefore, WIPO^[22] provides a complex search and browsing tool to navigate across IPC^[23]. However, this tool is integrated neither with patent databases nor with any patent search engines mentioned above.

The Universal Decimal Classification^[24] is another global taxonomy for bibliographic and library classification. However, it is not widely used in academic search engines and digital libraries due to its complexity and size. eLIBRARY.RU uses the National Classification for Scientific and Technical Information (NCSTI)^[25, 26], as an alternative version of the UDC created by VINITI [22]. Most Russian scientific journals have predefined sets of NCSTI categories according to the topic of published papers. Therefore, papers published in interdisciplinary scientific journals automatically belong to all NCSTI categories associated with the respective journal. Such an approach lowers precision of classification.

To summarize, the global taxonomies for topic identification and exploratory search have the following main problems:

- Large multi-level hierarchies are complex and intransparent to users;

[22] World Intellectual Property Indicators. Available at: <http://www.wipo.int/portal/en/>, last accessed July 5, 2014.

[23] IPC publication – WIPO. Available at: <http://web2.wipo.int/ipcpub/#refresh=page>, last accessed July 5, 2014.

[24] UDC Consortium. Available at: <http://www.udcc.org/>, last accessed July 5, 2014.

[25] State Classifier of Scientific and Technical Information. Available at: <http://www2.viniti.ru/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=57>, last accessed July 5, 2014.

[26] State Classifier of Scientific and Technical Information of Russia. Available at: <http://scs.viniti.ru/rubtree/main.aspx?tree=RGNTI>, last accessed July 5, 2014.

- Global taxonomies are volatile, since they are often reviewed and restructured (e.g., IPC);
- Scientific search and analytical services use incompatible taxonomies with different structure and no mappings between them are available;
- Manual assignment of topics is ambiguous in most cases. Moreover, there is a lot of information, which is potentially cannot be classified into predefined taxonomy [23].

Some *scientific analytical services and databases* (e.g., Scirus, Microsoft Academic Search, and Exactus Expert) offer their *own flat classification systems* to overcome these problems. In practice, these classifications contain about 20-30 categories. Generally, documents are assigned to categories with the help of mappings from taxonomies used by scientific journals. These flat classifications are useful only for the constriction of search areas and they are not suitable for exploratory search.

Scientific citation indexing services and databases Scopus and Web of Science also have their own classification systems that are created from taxonomies used by journals, which export their data to these systems.

The PubMed system offers a different approach to exploratory search. It uses the MeSH *thesaurus*^[27] as a controlled vocabulary and an interactive user interface tool for *query construction*. Because of its size, the thesaurus cannot be browsed easily. Therefore, indexed papers are available through the search, which takes into account MeSH descriptors as keywords or tags and other metadata constraints. An interactive form for query construction analyses user's input and shows matching descriptors from MeSH. In PubMed, users can sort search results by dates to browse the latest papers in the area of interest.

A more comprehensive tool for exploratory search is searching for *documents that are thematically similar* to a particular document or a set of documents. This function is called “similar” (IEEE Xplore, Scirus, and Exactus Expert) or “related” (PubMed, Google Patents, and Google Scholar) document search as well as “co-citations” and “clustered documents” (CiteSeer^X). Different approaches are used to implement these features in the aforementioned systems.

Analysis of bibliographic references and *comparison of papers by citations* is the most common approach. IEEE Xplore, Scirus, CiteSeer^X, PubMed, and Google Scholar consider papers similar if the first one cites the second one and they both have joint references. Although this approach has a simple implementation over the structured citation database and provides a good quality of exploratory search, it has some disadvantages. Citation distribution highly depends on a research area [24,25], language of scientific papers, affiliations of authors, their self-citations, and collaborations [26]. Thus, there is no guarantee that found information is representative and covers the research area entirely

[27] Medical Subject Headings. Available at: <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/>, last accessed July 5, 2014.

rather than just small part of it. However, Google Scholar uses this approach to characterize users' areas of interest and provide recommendations of recently published and indexed papers, in which they may be interested [27].

A lot of documents (e.g., patents) do not have references at all [28]. Therefore calculating similarity between these documents using citation analysis is not possible. An alternative approach is to use *keywords and phrases* as subject descriptors for the similar document search. In contrast to the first approach, which assumes that scientific documents in a particular research area share the same citations, the keyword-based approach relies on the hypothesis that papers in a particular research area contain the same lexis. This approach is implemented in Exactus Expert and Google Patents. The latter extracts key phrases from document text and provides full-text search for patent documents relevant to different combinations of these phrases. No more than 10-15 key phrases are usually offered to users. Exactus Expert extracts single and compound lexemes from texts with the help of a syntactic parser, puts them into inverted indexes, and provides the ability to search for similar documents on that basis. About 50-200 of the most significant words are used to characterize each document. Search results can be sorted by measure of similarity or by date.

2.5 Fast familiarization with documents in scientific analytical systems

Both in information and exploratory search users have to deal with many found documents. Sci-tech documents are long and complex. Reading all of them is a very arduous and time-intensive task [29]. Therefore users need some tools to determine quickly the topic and content of found documents and separate the relevant results from the irrelevant ones.

The systems that provide the full-text search commonly offer a user the brief description of found documents through *snippets*. Snippets are usually short extracts of text containing terms of a user's query.

To help users to perform the exploratory search most of the aforementioned systems characterize documents with *keywords and abstracts* provided by authors. This function is very useful, but sometimes these lists of keywords and abstracts are incomplete and do not present enough information about documents.

There is an alternative approach to introducing to users the topics and content of documents based on *text summarization* methods. Scientific analytical systems (Microsoft Academic Search, Google Patents, and Exactus Expert) provide keywords and key phrases automatically extracted from abstracts and full texts. Exactus Expert implements the text summarization algorithm, which builds a document summary on a user's demand. A summary consists of the most important sentences containing the most significant keywords of a document. There is also an ability to build the summary of a paper that contains sentences with definitions introduced by the authors and sentences that characterize the results of the paper.

2.6 Summary

Study of a research area is a complex task demanded by different categories of specialists involved in R&D. The considered search and analytical systems provide a large set of services that help users to study the most recent state of research in different domains. With the assistance of modern analytical systems, users are able to search for required information, understand the structure of the research area of their interest, and make themselves familiar with the topic and content of sci-tech documents. Table 2 summarizes features of the discussed analytical systems.

There are still many unresolved tasks in the area of scientific semi-structured information processing. The information retrieval methods for solving these tasks are in focus of the modern research. There are conferences, which purpose is to compare new information search and retrieval methods, and speed up the technology transfer from research labs to industrial analytical systems, e.g., TREC^[28], NTCIR^[29], CLEF^[30], SemEval^[31], and ROMIP^[32]. Despite growing quality of experimental methods, in practice, the widely used industrial analytical systems rarely use advanced information retrieval methods due to their computational complexity and prefer simple solutions for the real-world problems. Bringing new advanced methods to the widely used scientific analytical systems is a challenge.

3 Prospects assessment of research fields and forecast of their development

Another problem that arises in R&D activities is search for promising research fields and research groups. This problem involves the prospects assessment of research fields and forecasting their development.

3.1 Users and their goals

There are several categories of users whose needs and goals are related to the prospects assessment of research fields and forecast of their development.

Public state funds and venture companies look for the most promising innovative projects that can pay off in the near future to bring funding to them. Firstly,

[28] Text REtrieval Conference (TREC). Available at: <http://trec.nist.gov/>, last accessed June 17, 2014.

[29] NTCIR. Available at: <http://research.nii.ac.jp/ntcir/index-en.html>, last accessed June 17, 2014.

[30] The CLEF Initiative (Conference and Labs of the Evaluation Forum). Available at: <http://www.clef-initiative.eu/>, last accessed June 17, 2014.

[31] SemEval-2014 : Semantic Evaluation Exercises. Available at: <http://alt.qcri.org/semeval2014/index.php?id=tasks>, last accessed June 17, 2014.

[32] ROMIP: Russian Information Retrieval Evaluation Seminar. Available at: <http://romip.ru/en/>, last accessed June 17, 2014.

Table 2. Scientific analytical systems

System	Database update	Metadata search	Full-text search	Classification system	Similar / related document search	Summarization
ArXiv	manual	✓	✓	✓ own one-level	–	✓**
PubMed	manual	✓	✓	✓ MeSH	✓ (citation based)	✓**
IEEE Xplore	manual	✓	✓	✓ own one-level	✓ (citation based)	✓**
NGC	manual	✓	✓	✓ MeSH	–	✓**
EPO	manual	✓	✓	✓ IPC	–	✓*
USPTO	manual	✓	✓	✓ IPC	–	✓*
FIPS	manual	✓	✓	✓ IPC	–	✓*
Google Patents	automated	✓	✓	✓ IPC	✓ (keyword-based)	✓*
FPO	automated	✓	✓	✓ IPC	–	✓*
Scirus	automated	✓	✓	✓ own one-level	✓ (citation-based)	–
CiteSeer ^x	automated	✓	✓	✓ own one-level	✓ (citation-based)	✓**
Google Scholar	automated	✓	✓	–	✓ (citation-based)	✓*
Microsoft Academic Search	automated	✓	✓ (abstracts and descriptions only)	✓ own one-level	✓ (citation based)	✓**
Exactus Expert	automated	✓	✓	✓ own one-level	✓ (keyword-based)	✓***
Scopus	manual	✓	–	✓ own one-level	–	✓**
WoS	manual	✓	–	✓ own one-level	–	✓**
eLIBRARY .RU	manual	✓	✓ (abstracts and descriptions only)	✓ NCSTI	–	✓**

* – abstracts provided by authors

** – abstracts and keywords, provided by authors

*** – automatically full-text extracted keywords and automatically generated summaries

analysts of these funds should understand which research fields are developing and which have a tendency to stagnate. They need to evaluate a performance of the known research fields and *discover unseen or multi-disciplinary research fields* and directions that may be emerging. Secondly, analysts should find the most productive research groups that can advance in a given field and successfully accomplish a sci-tech project. Therefore, they need a way to *discover research groups*, determine in which scientific directions they work, and evaluate them.

Research institutions and managers should plan their research activity and guide their projects in the most perspective directions. They also search for promising researchers and experts qualified in certain areas to involve them in sci-tech projects.

Research groups and researchers themselves should assess the prospects of research topics, productivity, and their place in the global scientific context. They need to discover related research groups and fields to be aware of the state of the art. In addition, the subject of the study of researchers related to scientometrics lies in progress of research groups and their impact, relationships between the scientific communities, and their influence on each other.

3.2 Approaches and tools

The tasks related to the prospects assessment of research fields and forecast of their development can be solved by experts. However, this can be ineffective due to the subjectivity of experts and the complexity of the tasks. Traditionally scientometric problems were automatically solved using *bibliometric analysis* [30] and most of the aforementioned tasks are solved with the help of citation indexing services and databases.

The arsenal of bibliometric analysis tasks and approaches includes:

- *Calculating indices* or indicators that reflect the performance, impact or influence of a publication, researcher, institution, state, etc. This task is solved by methods for citation network analysis, which involve counting the number of citations, clustering, and co-citation analysis [31].
- *Analyzing research trends* for understanding the evolution, progress or regress of research processes. This task is solved by building trends for publication activity and other indicators of researchers, organizations, states, etc.
- *Structuring research fields*, which is also called mapping, assumes retrieving unseen research fields and sub-fields. For this task, methods for clustering of publications are usually applied. Similarity is calculated between bags of terms that are extracted from the metafields of publications such as titles, abstracts, and keywords.

There are several tools [32] and datasets [33,34] for analysis of citation networks. Scientometric problems are widely considered in the journal *Scientometrics*^[33].

State-of-the-art scientific analytical systems – SciVal^[34], Illumin8^[35] and Web of Knowledge^[36] – partially solve the tasks of searching for promising fields of research and research groups.

SciVal is the set of products and services based on Elsevier’s bibliographic database Scopus that supports decision making in research. The most significant functions of SciVal are the following: *building tailored reports* to analyze the achievements of researchers, teams, departments or custom-defined groups; *searching for experts or partners* by terms or free text identifying the topic of research; searching for comprehensive, accurate and current *funding opportunity* content; searching for unique *research strengths* of institutions to identify competitive advantages, threats, and opportunities; *identifying multidisciplinary strengths* to determine areas for further investment; *measuring the institution performance* against others through an easy comparison of research strengths; *understanding research trends* in the institution, country, and region to establish research strategy; *identifying the specific areas of research* excellence and the emerging strengths of an institution; *finding rapidly emerging research areas* and potential areas for further investment; *evaluating the productivity* of researchers and teams and their impact on other researchers and consumers of scientific information.

Many of these functions are implemented using *bibliometric analysis*. However, more advanced technologies are also used. One of the core components of SciVal is Elsevier Fingerprint Engine^[37]. Using a variety of Natural Language Processing (NLP) techniques and thesauri, it extracts and indexes weighted terms from the texts of scientific documents – publication abstracts, funding announcements, awards, project summaries, patents, proposals / applications, and other sources. The extracted *weighted terms* are called “*Fingerprint*” because they succinctly define scientific texts. Matching “Fingerprints” helps to find reviewers, funding opportunities, and suitable journals for publishing papers.

Illumin8 is another tool from Elsevier for exploring new processes and technologies, locating promising partners, monitoring competitors, and learning about the possible risks and benefits of trying novel approaches or getting into un-

[33] *Scientometrics*. Available at: <http://link.springer.com/journal/11192>, last accessed July 6, 2014.

[34] Products & Services — SciVal. Available at: <http://www.elsevier.com/online-tools/research-intelligence/products-and-services/scival>, last accessed July 6, 2014.

[35] illumin8 Elsevier. Available at: <http://www.elsevier.com/online-tools/illumin8>, last accessed July 6, 2014.

[36] Web of Knowledge. Available at: http://thomsonreuters.com/content/science/pdf/Web_of_Knowledge_factsheet.pdf, last accessed July 6, 2014.

[37] Elsevier Fingerprint Engine — SciVal. Available at: <http://info.scival.com/fingerprint>, last accessed July 6, 2014.

familiar markets. Illumin8 indexes *full-text articles* from ScienceDirect^[38] and *abstracts* from Scopus.

Web of Knowledge offers a variety of solutions for evaluating R&D performance^[39]. They mainly use the Web of Science citation base and support most of the functions implemented in SciVal. Essential Science IndicatorsSM is a single environment for research and bibliometric assessment and evaluation^[40] with the following abilities: analyzing the *research performance* of companies, institutions, and journals; identifying *significant trends* in the sciences; *ranking* top countries, journals, scientists, papers, and institutions by the fields of research areas; determining the *level of research results* and *impact* in specific fields of research.

Although the SciVal and Web of Knowledge provide some services that can partially solve the tasks of the prospects assessment of research fields and forecast of their development, in some cases such analysis could be unreliable due to incompleteness of their databases. Publications that are written in regional non-English languages are covered poorly in Scopus and Web of Science. The state-of-the-art scientific analytical systems analyze textual meta-information from names, titles, keywords, and abstracts, however full texts are hardly processed. Keywords and abstracts given by the author of a paper may present its content incorrectly, but the full text contains more useful information for processing than metafields.

Many scientific publications with full texts in different languages are freely accessible in the Web. These full-text publications can be a source for deep scientometric analysis, which can overcome aforementioned problems. In the recent years, the role of textual components has been growing and the combination of citation analysis and text-mining techniques has been used more often [35,36]. For example, Exactus Expert^[14] integrates both the generally accepted principles of bibliometric indicator assessment and methods for semantic analysis of textual information. The main idea of Exactus Expert is to use deep linguistic processing of full texts for retrieving useful information from unstructured scientific papers that helps solving many tasks more efficiently [13].

4 Quality assessment of scientific publications

This section is devoted to the techniques of quality assessment of scientific publications. Such techniques could be useful for researchers who describe the results

[38] ScienceDirect. Available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com>, last accessed July 7, 2014.

[39] Research Analytics – Research Analytics – Thomson Reuters. Available at: <http://researchanalytics.thomsonreuters.com/>, last accessed July 6, 2014.

[40] Essential Science Indicators – IP & Science – Thomson Reuters. Available at: http://wokinfo.com/products_tools/analytical/essentialsienceindicators/, last accessed July 6, 2014.

[14] Exactus Expert. Available at: <http://expert.exactus.ru/>, last accessed July 5, 2014.

of their studies (especially for students), for peer reviewers, the editors of scientific journals, and experts who would like to evaluate the quality of a publication before reading it. The following approaches based on the automatic analysis of texts could be applied to the assessment of the quality of scientific publications:

- Plagiarism and improper citation detection;
- Verification of compliance with the standard rules for writing primary scientific texts.

These approaches are considered in detail below.

4.1 Plagiarism detection

Improper citations and plagiarism often occur in research papers written by students and inexperienced researchers. Since the number of publications and citations measure a scientist's success, there is a temptation to usurp the scientific results published by other authors. Self-plagiarism as duplication of earlier research papers is also used to improve scientific indicators. Plagiarism is a serious problem in education too. It constitutes a serious misconduct, which can damage the integrity and prestige of the scientific community [37]. Therefore, improper citations detection is an important task that arises in R&D. The peer reviewers and editors of scientific journals should detect plagiarism in all its forms and prevent substandard papers from being published.

Thus, plagiarism and improper citations detection is the highly demanded feature of modern scientific analytical systems. There are numerous *computer-assisted plagiarism detection* (CaPD) systems (commercial or free services on the Web) that implement different approaches to this task: The Plagiarism Checker^[41], PlagScan^[42], Grammarly^[43], ChimpSky^[44], Copyscape^[45], PlagTracker^[46], Plagiarisma.ru^[47], Antiplagiat.ru^[48]. The Plagiarism Checker, PlagTracker, and

[41] The Plagiarism Checker. Available at: <http://www.dustball.com/cs/plagiarism.checker/>, last accessed July 6, 2014.

[42] PlagScan – Plagiarism checker. Available at: <http://www.plagscan.com>, last accessed July 6, 2014.

[43] Grammarly — Instant Grammar Check. Available at: <http://www.grammarly.com>, last accessed July 6, 2014.

[44] ChimpSky – Index – University of Waterloo. Available at: <http://chimpisky.uwaterloo.ca>, last accessed July 6, 2014.

[45] Copyscape Plagiarism Checker. Available at: <http://www.copyscape.com/>, last accessed July 6, 2014.

[46] PlagTracker. Available at: <http://www.plagtracker.com/>, last accessed July 6, 2014.

[47] Plagiarisma.ru. Available at: <http://plagiarisma.ru/>, last accessed July 6, 2014.

[48] Antiplagiat.ru. Available at: <http://www.antiplagiat.ru>, last accessed July 6, 2014.

Antiplagiat.ru are designed specifically to detect potential plagiarism in sci-tech content.

Most of the systems do not have their own databases and textual indexes for text matching. Usually they use the *API of web search engines* to perform search over the most valuable fragments of a given text (e.g., Chimpsky^[49], Copyscape^[50], PlagScan^[51], Plagiarisma.ru^[52]). The difference between these systems lies in search engines that are used to find similar textual fragments, ranking schemas, and reports presentation. They use various modifications of the Zipf's law [38,39] and *TF-IDF weighting schemas* [40] to determine the most valuable fragments of a given text.

Antiplagiat.ru has its own database, which it uses to find matching text fragments. The database contains scientific papers, students' essays, reports, theses from web sites along with Wikipedia and documents uploaded by users. It seems that the algorithm of Antiplagiat.ru is based on the modified fingerprint comparison described in [41,42].

The quality of improper citation detection strongly depends on how the database of a system covers potential plagiarism sources. Therefore, to provide the better recall of detection, PlagTracker combines both the considered approaches: it has its own database containing texts from academic sources and utilizes web search engines.

It is important to measure quality of systems for plagiarism and improper citations detection and compare them to each other. A good survey over the plagiarism detection software is presented in [43]. There is a special track on plagiarism detection at CLEF^[53]. The mentioned solutions are good enough to find simple "copy-and-paste" plagiarism, but they do not find paraphrased sentences, in which some words and phrases are replaced with synonyms and other wordings, since the bag-of-words and fingerprint analysis cannot deal with such cases. Moreover, none of the aforementioned CaPD systems provides the deep analysis of texts to distinguish improper and proper citations, whereas in the latter case references to sources are presented in a text.

4.2 Verification of compliance to standard rules for writing primary scientific texts

Many publications describe rules and standards, which should be complied by scientific paper [44,45], or rules to assess the quality of scientific research manu-

[49] Overview - Help on chimpsky. Available at: <http://chimpsky.uwaterloo.ca/help>, last accessed July 6, 2014.

[50] About Copyscape. Available at: <http://www.copyscape.com/about.php>, last accessed July 6, 2014.

[51] PlagScan – Our Technology. Available at: <http://www.plagscan.com/technology>, last accessed July 6, 2014.

[52] FAQ Plagiarisma. Available at: <http://plagiarisma.ru/faq.php>, last accessed July 6, 2014.

[53] PAN 2014. Available at: <http://pan.webis.de/>, last accessed June 17, 2014.

ally [46,47], but only few studies are devoted to automatic text quality assessment and a couple of them consider scientific publications.

According to standard requirements, a primary scientific text:

- Should have a *specific structure* that meets the paper design requirements of experiment- and theory-oriented literature;
- Should have a *specific scientific vocabulary* and contain phrases expressing the implementation of certain intellectual operations;
- Should contain *references* to other scientific publications;
- Should *not* be written in an *unscientific offensive language* or contain a *pseudo-scientific lexis*.

There is the general standard of scientific publication structure. The majority of scientific journal articles are written in the *IMRAD format*. That means that a text is typically divided into the following sections: “Introduction”, “Methods (Materials and Methods)”, “Results”, and “Discussion”. If an article is devoted to theoretical research, the “Methods” section is replaced by the “Theoretical Basis” [48]. In the English biological and medical periodicals, the share of articles structured in the IMRAD format was 80% by 1970, and since 1980 texts written in a different style are not accepted for publication [49]. Now this format has become the universal standard accepted by the majority of scientific journals.

A few researches investigate the problem of *structural components detection in a scientific publication*. This problem is often considered as the classification task. For instance, in [50] support vector machines (SVM) are used for the automatic classification of sentences in full-text biomedical articles into the IMRAD categories. Explored features included words, n-grams, the presence of a citation, verb tenses, and the positions of sentences in a text. This classifier achieved 81.3% accuracy, which is significantly higher than results of predecessors presented in [50].

Liakata et al. [51] proposed a method for the automatic recognition of conceptualization zones in scientific articles. There are 11 categories at the sentence level: “Hypothesis”, “Motivation”, “Goal”, “Object”, “Background”, “Method”, “Experiment”, “Model”, “Observation”, “Result”, and “Conclusion”. They trained machine-learning classifiers (support vector machines and conditional random fields) on a corpus of 265 full-text articles in biochemistry and chemistry. Acceptable results were obtained, some paper sections were recognized with a high accuracy and recall (for categories “Experiment”, “Background”, and “Model”, F-measure was 76%, 62%, and 53%, respectively). However, the method can currently be applied to only two scientific fields.

Another approach provides the ability to check the structure of publications from different scientific fields [52]. To determine the presence or absence of the structural components of an article, special markers were chosen. The markers

are semantic constructs that describe the typical and unique designs (of the author) of the structural components of a primary scientific text. For identification of markers, morphological, grammatical, syntactic, and semantic analysis of the verbal material, which is located within each structural component, was carried out. Lists of semantic and syntactic constructs that most likely belong to the one of the structural components of a publication were automatically obtained. It was shown that the automatic detection of such markers could be applied for the determination of paper sections independently from the topic of a paper.

Identifying section with results also gives an opportunity to understand the coherence of results obtained by authors with results published earlier. If the same results has been already described, the new paper is not worth publishing separately. To distinguish authors' results in an article, the method described in [53] could be used. It is proposed to detect a particular piece of knowledge that may represent the author's current work, or work reported elsewhere by using machine learning.

The *lexicon of scientific writing* consists of three main layers: *common words*, *general scientific words*, and *scientific terms*. In any scientific text, the common lexicon is a basis. General scientific words are used to describe phenomena in the different areas of science and technology. Term saturation is the characteristic feature of the style of scientific papers. Several approaches could be used for the estimation of scientific language level in an article.

Nenkova [54] proposed a method for *predicting general and specific sentences* and automatic assessment of sentence fluency in machine translation and summary coherence in text summarization. The author claims that a well-written text contains the balanced mix of general overview statements and specific detailed sentences. If a text contains too many general sentences it will be perceived as insufficiently informative, and too much specificity can be confusing for a reader. A logistic regression classifier trained on around the 2,800 examples of general and specific sentences from news articles marked by human annotators distinguished such sentences rather well. For sentences, in which all five annotators agreed about the class, the classifier could predict the correct class with 95% accuracy; for sentences, in which only four out of five annotators agreed, the accuracy was 85%. For sentences, which annotators found hard to classify in terms of general and specific, the accuracy of prediction was 75%. This method could be applied to scientific papers, which in terms of readability are distinguished from news articles by the higher percentage of specific detailed sentences.

Some studies are devoted to the *creation of a scientific lexicon*. The various corpora of scientific and unscientific material are processed and automatic analysis is applied for highlighting various phrases and utterances that are inherent to a general scientific writing. These items make up the vocabulary, which could be used to determine the level of the general scientific expressions in an article.

The presence of the *bibliography section* is an indispensable condition for an article to be published. However, there are articles (most often conference proceedings), in which the bibliography is absent or formatted so badly that it is hard to recover accurately what sources the author refers to. ParsCit [55] is the

state-of-the-art reference extraction system that uses heuristics to detect and segment references within a scientific article. Roman Kern et al. [56] proposed the extraction of references using layout and formatting information from scientific articles that increases in some cases F-measure by 3% comparing to ParsCit on the same dataset. Both systems are based on finding reference headers, which could be one of “References”, “Bibliography”, “References and Notes”, “Literature cited”. However, when an article does not contain such a header, the accuracy of the system decreases. Therefore, these methods still should be improved. ParsCit also can detect citations within a text. This useful function helps to find the lack of citations that might indicate the that the quality of a publication is low: if authors do not cite previous studies, it is the sign of their incompetence in a research subject.

Another important rule for a primary research paper is the *absence of unscientific and quasi-scientific lexis*. It is necessary to avoid the ambiguities and polysemy of various scientific concepts. Authors should not introduce new terms and definitions needlessly. Methods for the identification of texts written in unnatural language, which were automatically generated by computer programs, are being investigated. For example, methods designed for spam detection based on machine learning techniques could also be used for the detection of unusual unscientific lexicon. It could help to identify generated articles as well as quasi-scientific articles with questionable studies.

Distinguishing *speculative statements* from factual ones could be useful for the identification of texts that consist only of phrases, which convey uncertainty about the inferred conclusions. An approach, which is based on solving two sub-problems to identify speculative sentence fragments, is introduced in [57]. The first sub-problem is identifying the speculation keywords in the sentences and the second one is resolving their linguistic scopes. The first sub-problem is formulated as a supervised classification task, where potential keywords are classified as real speculation keywords or not by using the diverse set of linguistic features that represent the contexts of the keywords. After detecting the actual speculation keywords, the syntactic structures of sentences are used to determine their scopes. Linear SVM models are built for classification in this case as in many other systems described above. Good results were obtained (F-measure is 82% for full-text articles and 91% for abstracts), which is significantly better than the baseline methods considered in [57].

Thus, to establish whether an article is a complete primary scientific publication it is possible to perform the following types of analysis: determination of the *structural components* of the publication, checking presence of *references*, determining the level of the *general scientific lexicon*, *detection of unscientific and quasi-scientific lexis*.

5 Expert reviews of proposed R&D projects

One of the main tasks of R&D support is providing the expert review of proposed projects. When governments or private companies are looking for R&D projects,

they are interested in modern technologies, original ideas, novel research, and, of course, the feasibility of a project. Though these factors seem simple at the first sight, they are much more complex in practice, and the question of how to rank R&D projects is not an easy one.

The expert reviews of R&D projects are mostly done by human experts. This difficult task requires great responsibility. The entire process is divided into three main steps:

- Finding and assigning experts to projects.
- Examination of the projects by the experts.
- Ranking the projects.

The first step is to find experts for projects. There are several requirements for an expert: an expert has to be a person with good scientific papers and results; their research area has to be similar to the goals of a project, an expert cannot have any affiliations with a proposed project that can cause conflicts of interest. This task can be solved using the registry of experts^[54] or a scientific database^[15]. An expert's area of interest can be determined by examining their publications and keywords in their expert profile^[15]. However, it is not always possible to reveal a conflict of interest with a proposed project. To solve this task it is necessary to have brief overview of an expert's affiliation (a project group and an expert should not be co-workers). It is also a good idea to check an expert's papers for joint publications with researchers involved in a project.

The second step is the examination of the proposed projects. There are many criteria to examine projects: novelty, originality of ideas, area of application, competence of a project team, resource availability, etc. Most of these criteria can be checked by experts using a certain system. For example, it is possible to assess the quality of scientific texts, as described in section 4 of this chapter. The better the quality of the text is, the greater the chance is that the project will be accepted. The originality of ideas can be determined using the similar documents search. For example, some of the aforementioned analytical systems can find thematically similar papers.

The important part of R&D projects is a patent search. With the help of patent databases, it is possible to find documents in the same area of research. However, the quality of current patent database search engines is still not perfect. It can take a long time to find patents that are sufficiently similar to the project goals.

Another important factor is the qualifications of the project team. In general, the leader of a project has to be a well-respected person with good scientific

[54] Corpus expertov. Available at: <http://www.expertcorps.ru/>, last accessed July 6, 2014.

[15] Scopus. Available at: <http://www.scopus.com/>, last accessed July 5, 2014.

results in the area of a project. A project team has to be balanced and include scientists, engineers, PhD students, post doctoral, secondary staff, etc. For the evaluation of project teams, it is possible to apply methods of scientometrics (citations, indices, impact factors) [58] to profiles from scientific databases^[15,16,12]. The better the team is, the greater the chances of success of the project are.

The third step is ranking of the projects. Usually, the criteria are divided into several groups: the scientific level of projects and its prospects, the leader of a project and a project team, and resource provision of the project. Groups and criteria depend on the rules of a funding organization. Each group and criteria has a weighting coefficient and the final place on the list of a project is calculated as a weighted total. Of course, special expert opinions can be taken into consideration. It is common for experts' opinions to be very different and achieving agreement among experts can be a problem. The questions of decision making support are difficult, well-discussed elsewhere, and beyond the scope of this chapter. However, it is always possible to use certain instruments to check why experts have differing opinions. For example, if an expert gives a high rating to a weak research team, it may be the sign of a bias caused by conflict of interest. In this case, an additional examination and possibly the change of the expert are required. An expert's review tends to be more responsible, when the expert is aware of the possibility that their review will be verified.

6 Conclusion

The task of supporting scientific and technical activities is far from being solved. Rapid scientific development and the overgrowth of research areas, which are becoming immense, make the activities of R&D more and more complicated. To overcome obstacles arising around R&D it is important to develop and upgrade scientific search and analytical systems that could take on some of the common tasks. We believe that state-of-the-art systems fall seriously behind the today's needs of people involved in R&D. We are looking forward to the following two major problems being solved in the near future.

Many activities on the different stages of R&D lack automated information and analytical support. Scientometrics in addition to citation analysis will benefit from advanced IR techniques like deep full-text search, exploratory search, and metadata extraction from full texts. The study of research areas will be assisted by methods for thematic clustering analysis and automatic summarization. Automatic tools that help experts to check the quality of scientific publications and detect plagiarism will become widespread.

The problem of isolation and incompleteness of scientific information sources should also be a focus. To alleviate this problem, public scientific databases will

[16] Web of Science. Available at: <http://thomsonreuters.com/web-of-science-core-collection/>, last accessed July 5, 2014.

[12] Google Scholar. Available at: <http://scholar.google.ru/>, last accessed July 5, 2014.

continue to develop and gain significant influence compared to the commercial databases. Integrating the research published in regional languages with global science is also needed.

Acknowledgements

The chapter is supported by the Russian Academy of Sciences; project ONIT 2.9 “Development of methods and technologies Exactus Expert for semantic search and analysis of scientific publications”.

References

1. Marchionini, G.: Exploratory search: from finding to understanding. *Communications of the ACM* **49**(4) (2006) 41–46
2. White, R.W., Roth, R.A.: Exploratory search: Beyond the query-response paradigm. *Synthesis Lectures on Information Concepts, Retrieval, and Services* **1**(1) (2009) 1–98
3. Connor, J.: Google Scholar Blog Available at: <http://googlescholar.blogspot.ru/2013/11/google-scholar-library.html>, last accessed July 6, 2014.
4. Osipov, G., Smirnov, I., Tikhomirov, I.: Relational-situational method for text search and analysis and its applications. *Scientific and Technical Information Processing* **37**(6) (2010) 432–437
5. Ferreira, A.A., Gonçalves, M.A., Laender, A.H.: A brief survey of automatic methods for author name disambiguation. *SIGMOD Rec.* **41**(2) (August 2012) 15–26
6. Huang, J., Ertekin, S., Giles, C.L.: Fast author name disambiguation in CiteSeer. *ISI Technical Report* (2006)
7. Connan, J., Omlin, C.W.: Bibliography extraction with hidden markov models. Technical report, Department of Computer Science, University of Stellenbosch (feb 2000)
8. Hetzner, E.: A simple method for citation metadata extraction using hidden markov models. In: *Proceedings of the 8th ACM/IEEE-CS joint conference on Digital libraries*, ACM (2008) 280–284
9. Gupta, D., Morris, B., Catapano, T., Sautter, G.: A new approach towards bibliographic reference identification, parsing and inline citation matching. In: *Contemporary Computing*. Springer (2009) 93–102
10. Frakes, W.B., Baeza-Yates, R., eds.: *Information Retrieval: Data Structures and Algorithms*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA (1992)
11. Salton, G., Fox, E.A., Wu, H.: Extended Boolean information retrieval. *Communications of the ACM* **26**(11) (1983) 1022–1036
12. Beel, J., Gipp, B.: Google Scholar’s ranking algorithm: An introductory overview. In: *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Scientometrics and Informetrics (ISSI09)*. Volume 1. (2009) 230–241
13. Osipov, G., Smirnov, I., Tikhomirov, I., Vybornova, O.: Technologies for semantic analysis of scientific publications. In: *Intelligent Systems (IS), 2012 6th IEEE International Conference*, IEEE (2012) 058–062
14. Maron, M.E., Kuhns, J.L.: On relevance, probabilistic indexing and information retrieval. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* **7**(3) (1960) 216–244

15. Robertson, S.E., van Rijsbergen, C.J., Porter, M.F.: Probabilistic models of indexing and searching. In: Proceedings of the 3rd annual ACM conference on Research and development in information retrieval, Butterworth & Co. (1980) 35–56
16. Osipov, G., Smirnov, I., Tikhomirov, I., Zavjalova, O.: Application of linguistic knowledge to search precision improvement. In: Proceedings of 4th International IEEE conference on Intelligent Systems. Volume 2. (2008) 17–2–17–5
17. Giles, C.L., Bollacker, K.D., Lawrence, S.: Citeseer: An automatic citation indexing system. In: Proceedings of the third ACM conference on Digital libraries, ACM (1998) 89–98
18. Qiu, Y., Frei, H.P.: Concept based query expansion. In: Proceedings of the 16th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval, ACM (1993) 160–169
19. Huang, C.K., Chien, L.F., Oyang, Y.J.: Relevant term suggestion in interactive web search based on contextual information in query session logs. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* **54**(7) (2003) 638–649
20. Wilson, M.L., Kules, B., Shneiderman, B., et al.: From keyword search to exploration: Designing future search interfaces for the web. *Foundations and Trends in Web Science* **2**(1) (2010) 1–97
21. Fafalios, P., Salampasis, M., Tzitzikas, Y.: Exploratory patent search with faceted search and configurable entity mining. In: Proceedings of the Workshop on Integrating IR technologies for Professional Search, in conjunction with the 35th European Conference on Information Retrieval (ECIR'13). Volume 968., Moscow, Russia, CEUR Workshop Proceedings (2013)
22. Markusova, V.: All Russian institute for scientific and technical information (VINITI) of the Russian academy of sciences. *Acta Informatica Medica* **20**(2) (2012) 113–117
23. Hanbury, A., Lupu, M.: Toward a model of domain-specific search. In: Proceedings of the 10th Conference on Open Research Areas in Information Retrieval, Lisbon, Portugal (2013) 33–36
24. Vieira, E.S., Gomes, J.A.: Citations to scientific articles: Its distribution and dependence on the article features. *Journal of Informetrics* **4**(1) (2010) 1–13
25. Adler, R., Ewing, J., Taylor, P.: Citation statistics: A report from the international mathematical union (IMU) in cooperation with the international council of industrial and applied mathematics (ICIAM) and the Institute of Mathematical Statistics (IMS). *Statistical Science* (2009) 1–14
26. Figg, W.D., Dunn, L., Liewehr, D.J., Steinberg, S.M., Thurman, P.W., Barrett, J.C., Birkinshaw, J.: Scientific collaboration results in higher citation rates of published articles. *Pharmacotherapy: The Journal of Human Pharmacology and Drug Therapy* **26**(6) (2006) 759–767
27. Connor, J.: Google Scholar Blog Available at: <http://googlescholar.blogspot.ru/2012/08/scholar-updates-making-new-connections.html>, last accessed July 6, 2014.
28. Hall, B.H., Jaffe, A., Trajtenberg, M.: Market value and patent citations. *RAND Journal of economics* (2005) 16–38
29. Lupu, M., Hanbury, A.: Patent retrieval. *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval* **7** (2013) 1–97
30. De Bellis, N.: *Bibliometrics and citation analysis: From the science citation index to cybermetrics*. Scarecrow Press (2009)
31. Ding, Y.: Scientific collaboration and endorsement: Network analysis of coauthorship and citation networks. *Journal of informetrics* **5**(1) (2011) 187–203

32. Cobo, M.J., López-Herrera, A.G., Herrera-Viedma, E., Herrera, F.: Science mapping software tools: Review, analysis, and cooperative study among tools. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* **62**(7) (2011) 1382–1402
33. Tang, J., Zhang, J., Yao, L., Li, J., Zhang, L., Su, Z.: Arnetminer: Extraction and mining of academic social networks. In: *Proceedings of the 14th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, ACM (2008) 990–998
34. Radev, D.R., Muthukrishnan, P., Qazvinian, V.: The ACL anthology network corpus. In: *Proceedings of the 2009 Workshop on Text and Citation Analysis for Scholarly Digital Libraries*, Association for Computational Linguistics (2009) 54–61
35. Glänzel, W.: Bibliometric methods for detecting and analysing emerging research topics. *El profesional de la información* **21**(2) (2012) 194–201
36. Liu, X., Zhang, J., Guo, C.: Full-text citation analysis: A new method to enhance scholarly networks. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* **64**(9) (2013) 1852–1863
37. Horrom, T.A.: The perils of copy and paste: Plagiarism in scientific publishing. *Journal of rehabilitation research and development* **49**(8) (2012) 7–12 Available at: <http://www.rehab.research.va.gov/jour/2012/498/horrom498.html>, last accessed July 6, 2014.
38. Zu Eissen, S.M., Stein, B.: Intrinsic plagiarism detection. In: *Advances in Information Retrieval*. Springer (2006) 565–569
39. Bravo-Marquez, F., LHuillier, G., Ríos, S.A., Velásquez, J.D.: Hypergeometric language model and Zipf-like scoring function for web document similarity retrieval. In: *String Processing and Information Retrieval*, Springer (2010) 303–308
40. Potthast, M., Gollub, T., Hagen, M., Kiesel, J., Michel, M., Oberländer, A., Tippmann, M., Barrón-Cedeño, A., Gupta, P., Rosso, P., et al.: Overview of the 4th international competition on plagiarism detection. In: *CLEF (Online Working Notes/Labs/Workshop)*. (2012)
41. Brin, S., Davis, J., Garcia-Molina, H.: Copy detection mechanisms for digital documents. In: *ACM SIGMOD Record*. Volume 24., ACM (1995) 398–409
42. Stein, B.: Fuzzy-fingerprints for text-based information retrieval. In: *Proceedings of the 5th international conference on knowledge management (I-KNOW 05)*, Graz, Journal of Universal Computer Science. (2005) 572–579
43. Weber-Wulff1, D., Mller1, C., Touras2, J., Zincke, E.: Plagiarism detection software test 2013. Available at: <http://plagiat.htw-berlin.de/wp-content/uploads/Testbericht-2013-color.pdf>, last accessed June 17, 2014.
44. Steingraber, S., Jolls, C., Goldberg, D.: Guidelines for Writing Scientific Papers. Technical report (1985)
45. Szklo, M.: Quality of scientific articles. *Revista de Saúde Pública* **40**(SPE) (2006) 30–35
46. Gray, C.: Quality assurance and assessment of scholarly research. *Research Information Network* (2010) 23
47. Kmet, L.M., Lee, R.C., Cook, L.S.: Standard quality assessment criteria for evaluating primary research papers from a variety of fields. Number 13. Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research (2004)
48. Day, R.A.: The origins of the scientific paper: the IMRAD format. *Journal of the American Medical Writers Association* **4**(2) (1989) 16–18

49. Sollaci, L.B., Pereira, M.G.: The introduction, methods, results, and discussion (IMRAD) structure: A fifty-year survey. *Journal of the Medical Library Association* **92**(3) (2004) 364
50. Agarwal, S., Yu, H.: Automatically classifying sentences in full-text biomedical articles into introduction, methods, results and discussion. *Bioinformatics* **25**(23) (2009) 3174–3180
51. Liakata, M., Saha, S., Dobnik, S., Batchelor, C., Rebholz-Schuhmann, D.: Automatic recognition of conceptualization zones in scientific articles and two life science applications. *Bioinformatics* **28**(7) (2012) 991–1000
52. Kuznetsova, J., Osipov, G., Chudova, N. nad Shvets, A.: Automatic assessment of article conformity to the standards for scientific publications. *Proceedings of ISA RAS*. **62**(3) (2012) 132–138 (in Russian).
53. Waard, A.D., Thompson, P., Liakata, M., Nawaz, R., Anani-adou, S.: Comparing scientific discourse annotation schemes for enhanced knowledge extraction. In: *Proceedings of workshop Beyond the PDF*. (2011)
54. Nenkova, A.: Automatic text understanding of content and text quality. In: *Frontiers of Engineering 2011: Reports on Leading-Edge Engineering from the 2011 Symposium*. (2012) 49–54
55. Councill, I.G., Giles, C.L., Kan, M.Y.: Parscit: An open-source CRF reference string parsing package. In: *Proceedings of LREC*. Volume 28. (2008) 661–667
56. Kern, R., Kampfl, S.: Extraction of references using layout and formatting information from scientific articles. *D-Lib Magazine* **19**(9) (2013) 2
57. Özgür, A., Radev, D.R.: Detecting speculations and their scopes in scientific text. In: *Proceedings of the 2009 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Volume 3-Volume 3*, Association for Computational Linguistics (2009) 1398–1407
58. Hirsch, J.E.: An index to quantify an individual’s scientific research output. *Proceedings of the National academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **102**(46) (2005) 16569–16572