August 2015

Scientometric Analysis of Cloud Computing

Rosy Jan
University of Kashmir, hakimrosy@yahoo.co.in

Wasim Rashid Wani
University of Kashmir

Obaid Hafiz
University of Kashmir

Scientometric Analysis of Cloud Computing

Rosy Jan
Sr.Assistant Professor
Department of Library and Information Science
University of Kashmir, Hazratbal , Srinagar
hakimrosy@yahoo.co.in

Wasim Rashid Wani
Department of Library and Information Science
University of Kashmir, Hazratbal , Srinagar

Obaid Hafiz
Department of Library and Information Science
University of Kashmir, Hazratbal , Srinagar

Abstract

The paper analyses the growth pattern of cloud computing literature during 2009-2013 using web of science database. The cumulative publication output of top ten countries and India in the field accounts to 1879 publications. Total number of citations & high quality papers were also calculated. The growth in the publication is studied through Relative Growth Rate and doubling time. The authorship pattern is measured by different collaboration parameters like collaborative index and modified collaborative coefficient.

Keywords: *Scientometric, Cloud computing, Average citations, High Quality Papers, Relative Growth Rate. Doubling Time, Web of Science.*

Introduction

Cloud computing means storing and accessing data and programs over the Internet instead of your computer's hard drive. The cloud is just a metaphor for the Internet. It goes back to the days of flowcharts and presentations that would represent the gigantic server-farm infrastructure of the Internet as nothing but a puffy, white cumulonimbus cloud, accepting connections and doling out information as it floats. **(Griffith, 2013)** "Cloud computing" is the next natural step in the evolution of on-demand information technology services and products. To a large extent, cloud computing will be based on virtualized resources. Cloud computing predecessors have been around for some time now, but the term became "popular" sometime in October 2007 when IBM and Google announced collaboration in that domain. This was followed by IBM's announcement of the "Blue Cloud" effort. Since then, everyone is talking about "Cloud Computing" **(Vouk, 2008).** Cloud computing is a service where computing is provided as a commodity, much akin to electricity or cable television. Thus, cloud computing is not about a specific technology; rather it is a step in the commoditization of IT enabled by technological advances **(Iyoob, Zarifoglu, & Dieker, 2013).**

Bibliometrics represented a statistical approach to master the growing flood of scientific information and to analyse and to understand the cognitive characteristics of "big science" by measuring quantitative aspect of communication in science and by providing results to scientists & users outside the scientific community. There have been a number of techniques that have been evaluated during the passage of time to evaluate the resources. Bibliometrics is one of the techniques that have been adopted by the library professionals to explore the impact of any field of knowledge. While bibliometric methods are most often used in the field of library and information science, bibliometrics has wide applications in other areas. In fact, many research fields use bibliometric methods to explore the impact of their field, the impact of a set of researchers, or the impact of a particular paper. It utilizes quantitative analysis and statistics to describe patterns of publication within a given field or body of literature. Researchers may use bibliometric methods of evaluation to determine the influence of a single writer, for example, or to describe the relationship between two or more writers or works, or to identify the pattern of publication and authorship, citations used for a subject etc over a period of time. First scientometric applications were developed to improve use of bibliometric databases and extend information services. Citations were considered documented use of information & have consequently applied first in the context of librarianship, scientific information and information retrieval (Glanzel, 2008). Scientometric is the branch of science that describes the output traits in terms of organisational research structure, resource inputs and outputs, develops benchmarks to evaluate the quality of information output. it studies characterize the discipline using the growth pattern and other attributes. These studies have potential, particularly in assessing the emerging disciplines **(Ramachandran, 2012).** Mapping scientific fields is quite a common operation in bibliometric studies. Mapping is a study of correlation links between the past and present research work using citation analysis. Mapping is a technique used to analyze vast literature and molded in a particular form. This particular information format can be used by researcher effectively. Different elements of a bibliographic record may used to generate a map structure. Each element reveals a specific structure, unique in a sense, but always related to the structures based on other element **(Mithal, Ahmad & Singh, 2005**).

This study, aims to capture the overall publications of cloud computing among top 10 countries and India. It aims to study publication progress by means of Relative growth rate (RGR) and Doubling time (Dt), authorship collaboration is measured using scientometric tools such as collaborative index (CI), modified collaborative coefficient (MCC). In order to find out the quality of the research output, number of high quality paper's (NHQ) is applied.

Literature Review:

Authors have defined cloud computing on the basis of its use, capability and latest trends evolved in the field. According to (**Plummer, et al., 2009; Buyya et al., 2009**) it is a style of computing where massively scalable IT-related capabilities are provided as a service across the Internet to multiple external customers. **Staten, 2008** found it as a pool of abstracted, highly scalable, and managed infrastructure capable of hosting end-customer applications and billed by consumption. **Armbrust, et al., 2009** regard it as the ability to pay for use of computing resources on a short-term basis as needed. While as **(Vouk, 2008)** visioned it as a technology, embraces cyber-infrastructure, and builds on virtualisation, distributed computing, grid computing, utility computing, networking, and Web and software services. Various studies focus on the evaluation and optimisation of the performance of the clouds. It includes studies that attempt to quantify and compare performance across different clouds **(Iosup et al., 2011),** to enhance workflow scheduling and load balancing **(Byun, Kee, Kim, and Maeng, 2011; Kong, Lin, Jiang, Yan, and Chu, 2011),** to improve dynamic resource allocation **(Streitberger and Eymann, 2009; Warneke and Kao, 2011),** to enable automatic bottleneck detection **(Iqbal, Dailey, Carrera, and Janecek, 2011),** to estimate performance of cloud network with nodes failure (Lin and Chang, 2011), and to improve interoperability across different clouds. **(Beloglazov, Abawajy, and Buyya, 2011; Berl, Gelenbe, di Girolamo, Giuliani, de Meer, Dang, et al., 2010; Dougherty, White, and Schmidt, 2011; Katz, 2009)** concentrated on energy efficiency, power conservation, and environmental considerations in the design of data centres. Cloud security has been a common concern for the public (**Bellovin, 2011**). Some articles in this subcategory look at general security mechanisms such as restrictions and audits **(Spring, 2011a; Wang, Wang, Ren, Lou, and Li, 201**1), multi-tenancy authorisation **(Calero, Edwards, Kirschnick, Wilcock, and Wray, 2010),** third-party assurance **(Zissis and Lekkas, 2010),** and cloud-based security services **(Li, Li, Wo, Hu,Huai, Liu, et al., 201**1). Other articles addressing specific cloud related security issues fall into two categories: data security and network security. The data security category includes papers looking at data encryption (Anthes, 2010), data colouring, and software watermarking for multi-way authentications (Hwang and Li, 2010), and a data-partitioning scheme for implicit security **(Parakh and Kak, 2009).**

Bibliometric and Scientometric Analysis of Cloud Computing

There is a lack of a comprehensive scientometric study in the area of cloud computing. However following study encompass the field in terms of bibliometric and scientometric studies.

Sriram & Hosseini (2010) present a review of the work published by the academic community in the field of cloud computing using ACM Digital Library, IEEE Xplore, SpringerLink, ScienceDirect and Google Scholar. This study provides an overview of the swiftly developing advances in the technical foundations of cloud computing and their research efforts. **Ahmed, Chowdhury, Ahmed, & Rafee (2012)** presented an overview of cloud computing and focused on the state-of-the-art research and future issues to be handled by the research community. **Mirzaei (2008)** presents a brief survey based of readings on "cloud" computing and tries to address related research topics, challenges ahead and possible applications. **Haag & Eckhardt (2014)** applied scientometric research approach and undertakes a categorized literature analysis to provide a comprehensive and systemic overview of the current status of research on cloud services and their adoption by organizations. They review 52 journals and proceedings of the information systems field to identify systematically categorize 36 articles on the topic. The content-based analysis shows that the scarce theoretical and empirical work on organizational cloud service adoption has developed and explored factors that directly or indirectly drive organizations to adopt or inhibit them from adopting cloud services from different perspectives and dimensions. Study by (**Thirumagal, A. , Sethukumari, Niruba S ,2013)** analyse the quantum literature output in the area of cloud computing from 2008-2012 from the Web of Knowledge. The downloaded 2207 data were analysed with the Bibexcel Tool to identify and analyse the rate and growth of scholarly publication, analyse the authorship pattern and to examine the publication type of research, application of Lotka's Law, Creating Label View, Cluster View and finding the Citation map. Similar type of study carried out by **Sivakumaren, K.S., Swaminathan, S., Karthikeyan G. 2012** found that 510 records related to Cloud Computing in "Web of Science' appeared during the periods 2001-2010. It is found that the author "Buyya.R" and the country "USA" have produced the majority of records. An extensive insights into publication patterns, research impact and research productivity was undertaken by **(Heilig, L, 2014.)** Furthermore, the work studied the interplay of related subtopics by analyzing keyword clusters thus provides a better understanding of patterns, trends and other important factors as a basis for directing research activities, sharing knowledge and collaborating in the area of cloud computing research.

Scientometric Analysis of various subject areas focused on RGR, Dt, CC and MCC

The scientometric analysis of Indian engineering research output using Web of Science (WOS) database for the period 1999 to 2013 for identifying the research output in the field of engineering literature was taken by **(Hosamani & Bagalkoti, 2014) .** Study provided a comparative evaluation and performance of different types of scientometric indicators, such

as number of publications, number of citations, *relative growth, doubling time,* activity index and collaboration from India. **Karpagam, 2011** analysed the growth pattern of nanoscience and Nano technology literature 1990–2009.The study measures the performance based on several parameters, country annual growth rate, authorship pattern, collaborative index, collaborative coefficient, modified collaborative coefficient, subject profile, etc. **Ponnudurai & Thilakar (2013)** analysed the research output in Crop Science Research out during 1981-2010 included year wise distribution research growth, relative growth rate, exponential growth, Asian Countries publications' share, citation impact, share of international collaborative papers and major collaborative partner countries patterns of research communication in most productive journals. Similar type of study was carried out by **(Venkatesan, Gopalakrishnan , Gnanasekaran, 2013)** on climate change studying 94756 records contributed worldwide over a period of 1999-2012. Doubling time was also calculated in the study**. Ramiah & Kaliyaperumal (2014)** used engineering index database covering a period of 2003-2012 to investigate growth and development of mobile technology in terms of publication output .The average number of publications published per year was 14456.7 and the highest number of publications 20318 were published in 2011. Authors from China have contributed maximum .The study found that the relative growth rates (RGR) has decreased from 2004 (0.98) to 2012 (0.13) in the span of 10 years. The doubling time (DT) has gradually increased from 0.71 in 2004 to 5.15 in 2012. **Chitra (2012)** analyses the growth pattern of Neuroscience literature during 1972 – 2011 (40 years) using Scopus retrieving 35869 records. The growth in the publication is studied through Relative Growth Rate and doubling time. The authorship pattern is measured by different collaboration parameters like collaborative index, degree of collaboration, collaborative coefficient and modified collaborative coefficient. The quality of the journal is assessed by SJR and SNIP. A total of 1291 Indian contributions covered in SCOPUS database were analysed the academic productivity of food and nutrition scientists in India during the period of 1960-2011. The research output is highly scattered as indicated by the average number of papers per institution and per states in India. The food and nutrition output is dominated by the two authored papers. Further, the study investigated Relative Growth Rate and Doubling Time authorship pattern, co-authorship pattern, highly prolific authors, highly published institutions and highly preferred journals by the scientists of India. **Vellaichamy, Jeyshankar & Rao (2014).**

1.2 PROBLEM:

Scientometrics is one of the most important measures for the assessment of scientific productions. It is the quantitative study of the disciplines of science based on published

literature and communication. This includes identifying emerging areas of scientific research, examining the development of research over time, or geographic and organizational distributions of research. The present study makes an endeavor to gauge and analyze *the country productivity, quality of the output, citation count, authorship collaboration and literature growth* on cloud computing by applying various scientometric parameters to the published literature.

1.3 OBJECTIVES:

- To calculate total number of publications (TNP) and country ranking.
- To calculate number of high quality paper's (NHQ).
- To identify the citation impact of top ten countries and of India contributing to the field.
- To find out Relative Growth Rate (RGR) and Doubling Time (Dt).
- To find out authorship collaboration in terms of CI and MCC.

1.4 METHODOLOGY:

The study was carried out using Web of Science, an international database searched from 20th march to 10th- April-2014 for all records of papers of top ten contributing countries in the field and India.

In order to fulfill objective 1, the related database was visited and search term "cloud computing" within quotes was entered in the search box limiting the time span from 2009-2013. The result from all the countries were allowed to display in order to find out top productive countries in the field. The top ten countries were identified on the basis of highest number of publications retrieved from the database. Lastly India was included in the listing for comparison.

In order to fulfill objective 2, "*create citation report"* an option provided by the database was used for checking the "average citations". The results were sorted by *"Times cited highest to lowest"*. On the basis of earlier displayed results papers having citations more than double of average citations is calculated.

NHQ is based on the calculation of the citation per paper for different countries as the pattern of citation varied from one country to another country. Papers that received more than twice the average citations have been considered as high quality papers.

$$\text{NHQ\%}=\left(\frac{number\ of\ high\ quality\ papers\ for\ a\ country}{total\ number\ of\ high\ quality\ papers}\right)\times 100$$

In order to fulfill objective 3, results were sorted by *"Times cited lowest to highest* " and then results provided were analyzed.

The growth of publications was analysed by using two parameters Relative Growth Rate and Doubling time

(Mahapatra 1985). RGR is a measure to study the increase in number of articles of time , for calculating RGR, cumulative output Log2 or lnN2 of one year is subtract from Log1 or lnN1 of the same year which is Log2 of previous year and is calculated as

$$RGR = (\ln N2 - \ln N1) / (t2-t1)$$

Where N2 and N1 are the cumulative number of publications in the years t2 and t1.

Dt is calculated using following formula

$$Dt = \ln 2 / RGR$$

In order to fulfill objective 5 which is measuring author collaboration, it is measured using the formulas such as collaborative Index (CI) & Modified Collaborative Coefficient (MCC).

$$CI = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{A} jfj}{N}$$

$$MCC = \frac{A}{A-1}\left\{1 - \frac{A=\sum_{j=1}^{A}(1/j)fj}{N}\right\}$$

Where;

A= total number of authors

N= total number of papers

Fj= number of papers having j authors

J= number of authors in a paper.

Table 1: Ranking & yearly publications of countries

COUNTRY	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	TNP
USA	24 (3.83%)	82 (13.09%)	143 (22.84%)	153 (24.44%)	224 (35.78%)	626
CHINA	2 (0.54%)	18 (4.9%)	48 (13.07%)	92 (25.06%)	207 56.40%)	367
AUSTRALIA	4 (2.79%)	8 (5.59%)	24 (16.78%)	48 (33.56%)	59 (41.25%)	143
ENGLAND	7 (5.22%)	14 (10.44%)	21 (15.67%)	32 (23.88%)	60 (44.77%)	134
TAIWAN	_	5 (3.93%)	21 (16.53%)	40 (31.49%)	61 (48.03%)	127
S.KOREA	1 (0.86%)	7 (6.03%)	26 (22.41%)	31 (26.72%)	51 (43.96%)	116
SPAIN	4 (4.3%)	3 (3.22%)	13 (13.97%)	31 (33.33%)	42 (45.16%)	93
GERMANY	7 (7.86%)	9 (10.11%)	21 (23.59%)	20 (22.47%)	32 (35.96%)	89

CANADA	2 (2.35%)	5 (5.88%)	12 (14.11%)	21 (24.7%)	45 (52.94%)	85
JAPAN	4 (5.19%)	11 (14.28%)	39 (50.64%)	10 (12.98%)	13 (16.88%)	77
INDIA	_	_	6 (27.27%)	7 (31.81%)	9 (40.9%)	22
Total	55 (2.92%)	162 (8.62%)	374 (19.9%)	485 (25.81%)	803 (42.73%)	**1879**

Table 1 reveals the amount of publication on Cloud Computing during 5 years . USA has the highest number of publications 626 (33.31%) followed by China 327 (17.4%). India have the least number of publications 22 (1.17%) followed by Japan 77 (4.09). There is a tremendous growth in the publications of Cloud Computing from 55 (2.92%) publications in 2009 it escalates to 803 (42.73%) in 2013. India did not have any publication in 2009 and 2010. During the period of study a total of 1879 publications were published.

Table 2: Total publications, citations, average citation & high quality papers

COUNTRY	**TNP**	**TNC**	**AC**	**NHQ**	**NHQ%**
USA	626	3511	5.61	68	30.50
CHINA	367	790	2.15	49	21.97
AUSTRALIA	143	1117	7.81	16	7.17
ENGLAND	134	609	4.54	16	7.17
TAIWAN	127	268	2.11	17	7.62
S.KOREA	116	219	1.89	16	7.17
SPAIN	93	689	7.41	10	4.48
GERMANY	89	600	6.74	14	6.28
CANADA	85	351	4.13	8	3.60
JAPAN	77	123	1.60	7	3.14
INDIA	22	150	6.82	2	0.90
TOTAL	**1879**	**8427**	_	**223**	_

TNP: Total number of publications **TNC:** Total number of citations **AC:** Average citations

NHQ: Number of high quality papers.

Table 2 reveals the total number of citations and high quality papers and shows that USA leads the list with 3511 citations followed by Australia with 1117 citations. Least number of citations is of Japan with 123 citations followed by India with 150 citations. In case of high quality papers, out of a total of 223 papers, USA is on the top with 68 papers followed by China with 49 papers. Least number of high quality papers is of India with 2 papers followed by Japan with 7 papers. Out of the total of 1879 papers only 223 (11.86%) are high quality papers.

NHQ is based on the calculation of the citation per paper for different countries as the pattern of citation varied from one country to another country. Papers that received more than twice the average citations have been considered as high quality papers.

Table 3: Distribution of citations

No. of Citations	USA	China	Aus	Eng	Taiwan	S.Korea	Spain	Germany	Canada	Japan	India
0	281	185	45	48	64	58	42	34	40	36	8
1	88	69	25	27	25	20	19	10	19	16	3
2	44	37	13	13	10	13	4	11	6	13	1
3	40	21	10	10	9	9	5	9	6	5	3

4	25	6	7	9	2	2	3	2	2	2	2
5	16	13	5	4	5	4	3	1	1	1	-
6	15	7	7	2	3	1	1	2	2	1	-
7	16	7	5	2	-	1	-	2	-	-	-
8	11	3	3	2	1	1	3	1	1	-	1
9	13	2	1	1	1	2	1	-	1	-	1
10	6	2	3	-	2	1	-	1	1	-	-
11-50	62	14	16	14	5	4	10	14	4	3	2
51-100	6	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	1		1
>100	3	-	2	1	-	-	2	1	1	-	-

Table 3 reveals the distribution of citations were it is seen that the papers with "0" citation are highest (841), followed by the papers with "1" citation (321). Papers with 100+ citations are lowest (10) followed by papers with 51-100 citations (12). USA has the most number of publications with "0" & "1" citations having 281 & 88 publications respectively succeeded by China with 185 & 69 publications, and India has the least number of publications with "0" & "1"citations having 8 & 3 publications respectively and it is succeeded by Germany with 34 & 10 publications.

In case of 100+ citations USA tops the list with 3 publications and is succeeded by Australia & Spain each having 2 publications and China, Taiwan, S.Korea, Japan and India did not have any publication in 100+ citation category. In case of 51-100 citations USA again tops the list with 6 publications and is succeeded by China, Australia , England, Germany, Canada and India with each having 1 publication. Rest of the countries did not have any publication.

Table 4: Top 10 countries, and India's Research output, relative growth rate (RGR) and doubling time (Dt) of cloud computing

Country	Year	No.of publications	Cumulative	Loge1/lnN1	Loge2/lnN2	RGR	Dt
USA	2009	24	*24ln(24=3.18)*	-	3.18	**-**	**-**
	2010	82	106 *In(*	3.18	4.66	**1.48**	**0.47**
	2011	143	249	4.66	5.51	**0.85**	**0.81**
	2012	153	402	5.51	5.99	**0.48**	**1.44**
	2013	224	626	5.99	6.43	**0.44**	**1.57**
	2009	2	2	-	0.69	**-**	**-**

CHINA	2010	18	20	0.69	2.99	**2.3**	**0.3**
	2011	48	68	2.99	4.21	**1.22**	**0.57**
	2012	92	160	4.21	5.07	**0.86**	**0.8**
	2013	207	367	5.07	5.9	**0.83**	**0.83**
AUSTRALIA	2009	4	4	-	1.38	**-**	**-**
	2010	8	12	1.38	2.48	**1.1**	**0.63**
	2011	24	36	2.48	3.58	**1.1**	**0.63**
	2012	48	84	3.58	4.43	**0.85**	**0.81**
	2013	59	143	4.43	4.96	**0.53**	**1.31**
ENGLAND	2009	7	7	-	1.94	**-**	**-**
	2010	14	21	1.94	3.04	**1.1**	**0.63**
	2011	21	42	3.04	3.37	**0.69**	**1**
	2012	32	74	3.37	4.3	**0.57**	**1.21**
	2013	60	134	4.3	4.89	**0.59**	**1.17**
TAIWAN	2009	-	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
	2010	5	5		1.6	**-**	**-**
	2011	21	26	1.6	3.25	**1.65**	**0.42**
	2012	40	66	3.25	4.18	**0.93**	**0.74**
	2013	61	127	4.18	4.84	**0.66**	**1.05**
S.KOREA	2009	1	1	-	0	**-**	**-**
	2010	7	8	0	2.07	**2.07**	**0.33**
	2011	26	34	2.07	3.52	**1.45**	**0.48**
	2012	31	65	3.52	4.17	**0.65**	**1.06**
	2013	51	116	4.17	4.75	**0.58**	**1.19**
SPAIN	2009	4	4	-	1.38	**-**	**-**
	2010	3	7	1.38	1.94	**0.56**	**1.24**
	2011	13	20	1.94	2.99	**1.05**	**0.66**
	2012	31	51	2.99	3.93	**0.94**	**0.74**
	2013	42	93	3.93	4.53	**0.6**	**1.15**
	2009	7	7	-	1.94	**-**	**-**
	2010	9	16	1.94	2.77	**0.83**	**0.8**

GERMANY							**3**
	2011	21	37	2.77	3.61	**0.84**	**0.82**
	2012	20	57	3.61	4.04	**0.43**	**1.61**
	2013	32	89	4.04	4.48	**0.44**	**1.57**
CANADA	2009	2	2	-	0.69	**-**	**-**
	2010	5	7	0.69	1.94	**1.25**	**0.55**
	2011	12	19	1.94	2.94	**1**	**0.69**
	2012	21	40	2.94	3.68	**0.74**	**0.94**
	2013	45	85	3.68	4.44	**0.76**	**0.91**
JAPAN	2009	4	4	-	1.38	**-**	**-**
	2010	11	15	1.38	2.7	**1.32**	**0.52**
	2011	39	54	2.7	3.98	**1.28**	**0.54**
	2012	10	64	3.98	4.15	**0.17**	**4.08**
	2013	13	77	4.15	4.34	**0.19**	**3.65**
INDIA	2009	-	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
	2010	-	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
	2011	6	6	-	1.79	**-**	**-**
	2012	7	13	1.79	2.56	**0.77**	**0.9**
	2013	9	22	2.56	3.09	**0.53**	**1.31**

Table 4 represents Relative Growth Rate (RGR) and Doubling time (Dt). RGR is a measure to study the increase in number of articles of time **(Mahapatra 1985)** and the Dt is directly related to RGR. It is the time required for articles to become double of the existing amount.

As evident from the table, RGR of each country is decreasing year by year except of England, Spain, Canada and Japan. The RGR of England Canada and Japan shoots up in their last year while Spain's RGR rises in 2011. Germany is the only country whose RGR is inconsistent. In case of doubling time (Dt) it is on the rise usually except at the years where RGR is increasing.

Table 5: Authorship collaboration

Countr	**Yea**	**AUTHORS**							**CI**	**MC**

y	r	SINGLE	DOUBLE	THREE	FOUR	FIVE	SIX	>SIX		C
USA	2009	7	7	1	3	2	3	1	**3.125**	**0.496**
	2010	17	16	16	13	7	5	8	**3.585**	**0.560**
	2011	24	17	37	22	20	5	18	**3.965**	**0.028**
	2012	23	27	35	30	13	11	14	**3.653**	**0.601**
	2013	16	52	41	47	33	18	17	**3.825**	**0.650**
China	2009	_	1	_	1	_	_	_	**3**	**1.25**
	2010	2	1	3	5	3	1	3	**4.5**	**0.715**
	2011	1	3	11	12	14	1	6	**4.541**	**0.749**
	2012	2	4	19	31	22	8	6	**4.315**	**0.741**
	2013	3	18	39	59	44	30	14	**4.299**	**0.734**
Australia	2009	1	_	1	_	1	1		**3.75**	**0.770**
	2010	_	2	2	2	_	1	1	**3.875**	**0.791**
	2011	_	1	8	9	4	_	2	**4**	**0.761**
	2012	8	7	13	8	8	4	_	**3.270**	**0.594**
	2013	1	10	16	15	5	8	4	**4.033**	**0.709**
	2009	1	1	2	_	_	_	3	**10.285**	**0.783**

England	2010	4	1	2	2	_	_	5	**5**	**0.602**
	2011	5	4	4	7	_	_	1	**4.142**	**0.546**
	2012	5	6	6	3	4	2	6	**4.343**	**0.629**
	2013	9	12	9	12	8	3	7	**3.816**	**0.612**
Taiwan	2009	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
	2010	1	1	1	_	2	_	_	**3.2**	**0.692**
	2011	2	3	9	2	3	_	2	**3.619**	**0.660**
	2012	3	12	8	7	6	1	3	**3.55**	**0.638**
	2013	5	15	15	15	5	4	2	**3.327**	**0.629**
S. Korea	2009	_	_	1	_	_	_	_	**3**	**0.67**
	2010	_	2	3	_	1	_	1	**5.143**	**0.792**
	2011	3	4	8	4	5	1	1	**3.5**	**0.643**
	2012	2	6	10	4	4	3	2	**4**	**0.674**
	2013	6	12	12	9	9	2	1	**3.274**	**0.610**
Spain	2009	_	_	_	2	_	_	2	**18**	**0.186**
	2010	_	_	_	1	_	_	2	**10.666**	**1.305**
	2011	_	1	4	5	2	1		**3.846**	**0.779**

	2012	_	_	6	6	11	3	5	**5.322**	**0.810**
	2013	_	3	8	13	12	3	3	**4.380**	**0.763**
Germany	2009	_	2	_	1	_	_	4	**10.285**	**0.916**
	2010	1	_	1	_	_	_	7	**9.777**	**0.886**
	2011	1	4	4	6	2		4	**5.857**	**0.727**
	2012	_	3	3	6	1	2	5	**5.8**	**0.793**
	2013	2	2	8	6	6	2	6	**4.687**	**0.730**
Canada	2009	1	_	_	_	1	_	_	**3**	**0.8**
	2010	1	1	1	1	_	_	1	**4**	**0.705**
	2011	2	2	3	3	_	_	2	**4.583**	**0.646**
	2012	_	8	5	4	1	3	_	**3.333**	**0.682**
	2013	_	6	9	7	12	7	4	**4.377**	**0.740**
Japan	2009	1	_	2	1	_	_	_	**2.75**	**0.697**
	2010	2	1	5	2	_	_	1	**3.363**	**0.624**
	2011	7	13	10	4	2		3	**3.051**	**0.538**
	2012	1	1	3	3	1	1		**3.5**	**0.709**
	2013	2	1	2	4	3		1	**4.076**	**0.680**

India	2009	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
	2010	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
	2011	_	5	1	_	_	_	_	**2.166**	**0.634**
	2012	2	1	4	_	_	_	_	**2.285**	**0.528**
	2013	2	2	2	_	1	1	1	**4**	**0.614**

Table 5 represents the authorship collaboration were it is seen that three authored papers are highest (413) followed by four authored papers (397) it is further noticed that six authored papers are lowest (135) followed by one authored papers (176). In three and four authored papers USA is on the top with 130 and 115 papers respectively and India is at the bottom with 7 publications in three authored papers and zero publications in the category of four authored papers.

Conclusion

Considering the above facts it is concluded that the research output in the field of cloud computing was higher i.e. *1879* during the block year 2009-2013. Publications goes on increasing every year. It increases from 55 publications in 2009 to 803 publications in 2013 witnessing a tremendous growth.USA is on the top having 626 publications in five years and is followed by China with 367 publications. India has the least publications only 22. RGR and Dt are inversely proportional i.e. rate of growth of publication was decreased and the corresponding Dt was increased. The findings of total citations reveals that total number of citations & high quality papers are 8427 & 223 respectively. In case of total citations and high quality papers USA is up on the list with 3511 citations & 68 high quality papers. In total citations USA is succeeded by Australia with 1117 citations and in case of high quality papers is succeeded by china with 49 high quality publications. Out of the total publications percentage of high quality papers is 11.86% only which shows that majority of publications are not cited or cited only a few times. It is more evident from the summary of the distribution of citations where it is found that the papers with "0" citation are highest with 841 publications and is followed by the publications with "1" citation which are 321 in total. To evaluate the author collaboration Collaborative Index (CI), and Modified Collaborative

Coefficient (MCC) were employed and proved that 90% of the research outputs were of collaborative in nature. In India the research in this field is infantile stage. This may be due to non availability of funds and supportive training programs. Strengthening of training programs at institutional level, national and international level becomes mandatory. The lacking on the contribution may be due to non availability of international collaboration

References:

Ahmed, M., Sina, A., Chowdhury, R., Ahmed, M., & Rafee, M. H. (2012). An Advanced Survey on Cloud Computing and State-of-the-art Research Issues. *International Journal of Computer Science Issues*, *9*(1), 201–207.

Armbrust, M., A. Fox, R., Griffith, A.D., Joseph, R. Katz, A. Konwinski, et al. (2009) "Above the Clouds: A Berkeley View of Cloud Computing," www.eecs.berkeley.edu/Pubs/TechRpts/2009/EECS-2009-28.pdf

Beloglazov, A., J. Abawajy, and R. Buyya (2011) "Energy-aware Resource Allocation Heuristics for Efficient Management of Data Centers for Cloud Computing", *Future Generation Computer Systems* (28)5*,* pp. 755-768 doi: 10.1016/j.future.2011.04.017.

Berl, A., E. Gelenbe, M. di Girolamo, G. Giuliani, H. de Meer, M. Dang, et al. (2010) "Energy-Efficient Cloud Computing," *The Computer Journal* (53)7, p. 1045.

Buyya, R., C.S. Yeo, S. Venugopal, J. Broberg, and I. Brandic (2009) "Cloud Computing and Emerging IT Platforms:Vision, Hype, and Reality for Delivering Computing as the 5th Utility," *Future Generation Computer Systems,*(25)6, pp. 599–616.

Byun, E.–K., Y.–S. Kee, J.–S. Kim, and S. Maeng, S. (2011) "Cost Optimized Provisioning of Elastic Resources for Application Workflows", *Future Generation Computer Systems (27)8,* pp. 1011-1026, doi:10.1016/j.future.2011.05.001.

Calero, J.M.A., N. Edwards, J. Kirschnick, L. Wilcock, and M. Wray (2010) "Toward a Multi-Tenancy Authorization System for Cloud Services," *IEEE Security & Privacy* (8)6, pp. 48–55.

Chitra, V., & Jeyshankar, R. (2012). Growth of Literature in Neuroscience: A scientometric study (1972-2011). Journal of Advances in Library and Information Science, 1(4), 201-210.

Dougherty, B., J. White, and D.C. Schmidt (2011) "Model-driven Auto-scaling of Green Cloud Computing Infrastructure," *Future Generation Computer Systems* (28)2*,* pp. 371-378, doi: 10.1016/j.future.2011.05.009.

Haag, S., & Eckhardt, A. (2014). Organizational cloud service adoption: a scientometric and content-based literature analysis. *Journal of Business Economics*, *84*(3), 407–440. doi:10.1007/s11573-014-0716-6

Heilig, L, 2014. A Scientometric Analysis of Cloud Computing Literature, *IEEE Transactions on Cloud Computing* Volume:PP (99) 10.1109/TCC.2014.2321168

Hosamani, M. S. C., & Bagalkoti, V. T. 2014 Scientometric Analysis of Indian Engineering Literature during 1999-2013.*International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, Vol 5(Issue 5) http://www.ijser.org

Iosup, A., S. Ostermann, M.N. Yigitbasi, R. Prodan, T. Fahringer, and D.H.J. Epema (2011) "Performance Analysis of Cloud Computing Services for Many-tasks Scientific Computing," *Parallel and istributed Systems, IEEE Transactions* (22)6, pp. 931–945.

Iqbal, W., M.N. Dailey, D. Carrera, and P. Janecek (2011) "Adaptive Resource Provisioning for Read Intensive Multitier Applications in the Cloud," Future Generation Computer Systems (27)6, pp. 871–879, doi: 10.1016/j.future.2010.10.016.

Karpagam, R., Gopalakrishnan, S., Natarajan, M., & Babu, B. R. (2011). Mapping of nanoscience and nanotechnology research in India: a scientometric analysis, 1990–2009. Scientometrics, 89(2), 501-522.

Katz, R. (2009) "Tech Titans Building Boom," *IEEE Spectrum* (46)2, p. 40.

Katzan Jr., Bellovin, S.M. (2011) "Clouds from Both Sides, *IEEE Security & Privacy* (9)3, pp. 88–88.

Kong, X., C. Lin, Y. Jiang, W. Yan, and X. Chu (2011) "Efficient Dynamic Task Scheduling in Virtualized Data Centers with Fuzzy Prediction," Journal of Network and Computer Applications (34)4, pp. 1068–1077, doi:10.1016/j.jnca.2010.06.001.

Li, J., B. Li, T. Wo, C. Hu, J. Huai, L. Liu, et al. (2011) "CyberGuarder: A Virtualization Security Assurance Architecture for Green Cloud Computing," *Future Generation Computer Systems* (28)2, pp. 379-390, doi:10.1016/j.future.2011.04.012.

Parakh, A., and S. Kak (2009) "Online Data Storage Using Implicit Security," *Information Sciences,* (179)19, pp.3323-3331.

Plummer, D.C., D.M. Smith, T.J. Bittman, D.W. Cearley, D.J. Cappuccio, D. Scott, et al. (2009) "Five Refining Attributes of Public and Private Cloud Computing," http://www.gartner.com/DisplayDocument?doc_cd=67182&ref=g_fromdoc

Ponnudurai, R. , Thilakar, S. (2013). Mapping of Crop Science Research Output: A Scientometric Analysis. *Journal of Advances in Library and Information Science*, 2(3), 134-137.

http://www.jalis.in/pdf/Pdf2-3/6-Bal-Ponnudurai.pdf

Ramiah, S. K., & Kaliyaperumal, K. (2014). Mapping of Mobile Technology Publications: A Scientometric Approach. DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology, 34(4).

Sivakumaren, K.S., Swaminathan, S., Karthikeyan G. 2012. Growth and Development of Publication on Cloud Computing: A Scientometric Study ,*International Journal of Information Library and Society,*Vol 1 (1) , Retrieved from http://www.publishingindia.com/ijils/52/growth-and-development-of-publication-on-cloud-computing-a-scientometric-study/166/1310/

Spring, J. (2011a) "Monitoring Cloud Computing by Layer, Part 1," *IEEE Security & Privacy* (9)2, pp. 66–68.

Sriram, I., & Khajeh-Hosseini, A. (2010). Research agenda in cloud technologies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1001.3259*.

Staten, J. (2008) "Is Cloud Computing Ready for the Enterprise?" http://vu2aut.persiangig.com/ECommerce/Forrester-Cloud-computing-report080307% 5B1%5D.pdf

Streitberger, W., and T. Eymann (2009) "A Simulation of an Economic, Self-organising Resource Allocation

Approach for Application Layer Networks," *Computer Networks* (53)10, pp. 1760–1770
doi:10.1016/j.comnet.2008.10.020.

Thirumagal, A. , Sethukumari, Niruba S , 2013. Mapping of Scholarly Research in Cloud Computing: A

Bibliometric Study, *SRELS journal of information management,* vol 50(5), Retrieved from

http://srels.org/index.php/sjim/article/view/43804

Vellaichamy, A., Jeyshankar, R., & Rao, P. N. (2014). Mapping of Research Output of Food and Nutrition

Literature in India. International Journal of Information Dissemination and Technology, 4(1).ijidt.com

Venkatesan. M., Gopalakrishnan S., Gnanasekaran ,D. (2013).Growth of Literature on Climate Change

Research: A Scientometric Study *Journal of Advances in Library and Information Science* Vol. 2(4) pp.236-242

http://www.jalis.in/pdf/Pdf2-4/Venkatesan.pdf

Vouk, M.A. (2008) "Cloud Computing—Issues,Research and Implementations," *Journal of Computing and Information Technology* (4), pp. 235–246.

Warneke, D., and O. Kao (2011) "Exploiting Dynamic Resource Allocation for Efficient Parallel Data Processing in the Cloud," *Parallel and Distributed Systems, IEEE Transactions* (22)6, pp. 985–997.

Wang, Q., C. Wang, K. Ren, W. Lou, and J. Li (2011) "Enabling Public Auditability and Data Dynamics for Storage Security in Cloud Computing," *Parallel and Distributed Systems, IEEE Transactions* (22)5, pp. 847–859.

Zissis, D., and D. Lekkas (2010) "Addressing Cloud Computing Security Issues," *Future Generation Computer Systems* (28)3, pp.583-592 , , doi: 10.1016/j.future.2010.12.006.