

Rebuttal to: Liu et al. “Progress in global parallel computing research: a bibliometric approach”, vol. 95, pp 967–983

Yuh-Shan Ho¹

Received: 9 May 2016 / Published online: 28 May 2016
© Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, Hungary 2016

Liu et al. (2013) published the paper entitled “Progress in global parallel computing research: a bibliometric approach”. In the Classic bibliometric methods section, the authors mentioned that “In the analysis of keywords, the 22 years (1990–2011, ISI database collected the author keywords from 1990) were divided into four periods: 1990–1995, 1996–2000, 2001–2005 and 2006–2011.” without any reference. In recent years, Ho and co-workers proposed the distribution of words in the article title and abstract, author keywords, and *KeyWords Plus* in different periods (Xie et al. 2008; Zhang et al. 2010), for example 2-year (Fu et al. 2014), 4-year (Li et al. 2009), 5-year (Tan et al. 2014), and 6-year (Ho et al. 2010) interval, to evaluate trends in research topics (Li et al. 2009, Zhang et al. 2010; Mao et al. 2010, Fu et al. 2013). The concept of Table 2 in the original paper (Liu et al. 2013) was also reported in several research topics (Xie et al. 2008; Li et al. 2009; Ho et al. 2010). In recent year, similar comments have also been published in *Environmental Earth Sciences* (Ho 2016).

Figure 1 in the original paper (Liu et al. 2013) shows “The development of parallel computing research can be divided into three stages”. This overlooks the fact since 1991, abstract information has been included in it the SCI database (Ho et al. 2010). In 1990, only 20 % articles had abstract information in Web of Science. However, since 1991 more than 90 % of articles include abstract information (Ho 2013). It is thus clear that analysis of publications before 1991 is not appropriate for investigating publication trends. Thus discussions about Fig. 1 in the original paper (Liu et al. 2013) is not appropriate. The same comments were also presented for “A bibliometric study of earthquake research: 1900–2010” (Liu et al. 2012) published in *Scientometrics* with the same corresponding author Yaolin Liu.

It is generally accepted that citing the original paper is not only respecting authors who presented a novel idea in research but also to read the original idea in detail of the work

✉ Yuh-Shan Ho
ysho@asia.edu.tw

¹ Trend Research Centre, Asia University, Taichung 41354, Taiwan

(Ho 2014). When a scientific publication duplicate previously published idea, text, equations, or figures without any citations, it frequently is regarded as a sign of possible plagiarism (Hunter 1994; Noè and Batten 2006). In my view, Liu et al. (2013) should have cited the original paper for what they mentioned in their paper and thereby provided greater accuracy and information details about the idea and the methods that they employed.

References

- Fu, H. Z., Long, X., & Ho, Y. S. (2014). China's research in chemical engineering journals in Science Citation Index Expanded: A bibliometric analysis. *Scientometrics*, 98(1), 119–136.
- Fu, H. Z., Wang, M. H., & Ho, Y. S. (2013). Mapping of drinking water research: A bibliometric analysis of research output during 1992–2011. *Science of the Total Environment*, 443, 757–765.
- Ho, Y. S. (2013). Comments on “A bibliometric study of earthquake research: 1900–2010”. *Scientometrics*, 96(3), 929–931.
- Ho, Y. S. (2014). Comments on “Adsorption characteristics and behaviors of graphene oxide for Zn(II) removal from aqueous solution”. *Applied Surface Science*, 301, 584.
- Ho, Y. S. (2016). Rebuttal to: “A bibliometric review on carbon cycling research during 1993–2013” by Zhi et al. (*Environ Earth Sci* 2015, 74(7): 6065–6075). *Environmental Earth Sciences*, 75(9), 1–2.
- Ho, Y. S., Satoh, H., & Lin, S. Y. (2010). Japanese lung cancer research trends and performance in Science Citation Index. *Internal Medicine*, 49(20), 2219–2228.
- Hunter, T. B. (1994). Point-counterpoint. Plagiarism: What is it, whom does it offend, and how does one deal with it? *Academic Radiology*, 1(2), 191–193.
- Li, L. L., Ding, G. H., Feng, N., Wang, M. H., & Ho, Y. S. (2009). Global stem cell research trend: Bibliometric analysis as a tool for mapping of trends from 1991 to 2006. *Scientometrics*, 80(1), 39–58.
- Liu, Z. Q., Liu, Y. L., Guo, Y. J., & Wang, H. (2013). Progress in global parallel computing research: A bibliometric approach. *Scientometrics*, 95(3), 967–983.
- Liu, X. J., Zhan, F. B., Hong, S., Niu, B. B., & Liu, Y. L. (2012). A bibliometric study of earthquake research: 1900–2010. *Scientometrics*, 92(3), 747–765.
- Mao, N., Wang, M. H., & Ho, Y. S. (2010). A bibliometric study of the trend in articles related to risk assessment published in Science Citation Index. *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment*, 16(4), 801–824.
- Noè, L. F., & Batten, D. J. (2006). ‘Publish or perish’: The pitfalls of duplicate publication. *Palaeontology*, 49(6), 1365–1367.
- Tan, J., Fu, H. Z., & Ho, Y. S. (2014). A bibliometric analysis of research on proteomics in Science Citation Index Expanded. *Scientometrics*, 98(2), 1473–1490.
- Xie, S. D., Zhang, J., & Ho, Y. S. (2008). Assessment of world aerosol research trends by bibliometric analysis. *Scientometrics*, 77(1), 113–130.
- Zhang, G. F., Xie, S. D., & Ho, Y. S. (2010). A bibliometric analysis of world volatile organic compounds research trends. *Scientometrics*, 83(2), 477–492.