Winter 11-20-2018

Publication meant for highly quality research through LIS in India: The Special Reference to DESIDOC Journal of Library and Information Technology (DJLIT).

Baskaran C. Chinnasamy Kavitha
Alagappa University, Karaikudi, India, cbklis@gmail.com

C. Baskaran
Alagappa University

Publication meant for highly quality research through LIS in India: The Special Reference to DESIDOC Journal of Library and Information Technology (DJLIT).

C. BASKARAN
Librarian & Project Director (ICSSR),
Alagapppa University, Karaikudi-63003, Tamilnadu,

Abstract

The analysed the research publications contributions of the LIS researchers in DJLIT (DESIDOC Journal of Library and Information technology) during 2011-2017. The total no. 419bibliographical records were retrieved from DJLIT website during the period of study. The result of the study observed that Maximum of 70 papers was brought out in the year 2012. It followed by 66 papers published in 2013. The study found that DJLIT productivity range of publications between 12.17 and 16.76 over the period of study. RGR and Dt was an increasing and a decreasing trend observed over period of study. It is found that highest RGR was 0.18 in 2012 and lowest RGR was 0.04 known in two years 2014 and 2016 it could be observed RGR and Dt went on exponential growth were does not progress during the period. 36.75 % of the publications shared single author. 63.25 % of the publications contributed in collaborative nature. It is observed that majority of publications 44.15 % representing by the two authors in the analysis BM. Guptha was published 18 papers in DJLIT, who is a ranked 1 author. It followed by Chenupathi K. Ramiah shored second his publications 11.University of Delhi, which is the top ranked institution. It is followed by NISTADS (24), DRDO (22), Pondicherry University (13), Banaras Hindu University (11) , Indian Institute of technology (11) and University of Kashmir (10).

Keyword: DESIDOC, Relative Growth Rate (RGR), Doubling time (Dt), Degree of Collaboration (DC), Collaborative Index (CI), Collaborative Co-efficient (CC), Modified Collaborative Index (MCC), Authorship Pattern, Citations

Introduction

Modern Scientometrics is mostly based on the work of Derek J. de Solla Price and Eugene Garfield. The latter created the Science Citation Index (Leydesdorff & Milojevic, 2013) and founded the Institute for Scientific Information which is heavily used for Scientometric analysis. A dedicated academic journal, Scientometrics, was established in 1978. The industrialization of science increased the quantity of publications and research outcomes and the rise of the computers allowed effective analysis of this data, (De Solla Price, 1978) while the sociology of science focused on the behavior of scientists, Scientometrics focused on the analysis of publications. Accordingly, Scientometrics is also referred to as the scientific and empirical study of science and its outcomes.(Lowry, Paul Benjamin et-al, 2004 & 2013) Later, around the turn of the century, evaluation and ranking of scientists and institutions came more into the spotlights. Based on Bibliometric analysis of scientific publications and citations, the Academic Ranking of World Universities ("Shanghai ranking") was first published in 2004 by the Shanghai Jiao Tong University. Impact factors became an important tool to choose between different journals and the rankings such as the Academic Ranking of World Universities and the Times Higher Education World University

Rankings (THE-ranking) became a leading indicator for the status of universities. The h-index became an important indicator of the productivity and impact of the work of a scientist. However, alternative author-level indicators have been proposed (Belikov, A.V & Belikov, V.V 2015) .

DESIDOC Journal of Library and Information Technology (DJLIT)

Started in 1981, DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology (DJLIT) is a peer-reviewed, open access, bi-monthly journal that publishes original research and review papers related to library science and IT applied to library activities, services, and products. Major subject fields covered include: Information systems, Knowledge management, Collection building & management, Information behaviour & retrieval, Librarianship/library management, Library & information services, Records management & preservation, etc.

DJLIT has been Indexed in Scopus, LISA, LISTA, EBSCO Abstracts/Full-text, Library Literature and Information Science Index/Full-text, The Informed Librarian Online, OpenJ-Gate, Indian Science Abstracts, Indian Citation Index, Full text Sources Online, WorldCat, Proquest, Google Scholar, Ulrich's International Periodical Directory, Index Copernicus, and OCLC.

Review of Literature

Tripathi a and Garg (2016) have explored on highest productivity coefficient is 1.0 during 1978-81, 1996, 1999-2003 and 2005-2009. Kalyane had 50 collaborators of which Vijay Kumar, ER Prakasan, B S Kademani, Anil Sagar and Anil Kumar were the most active or core collaborators. He used 65 communication channels to disseminate the results of his research of which Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Sciences (11 papers) tops of the list followed by Annals of Library and Information Studies (7 papers), Scientometrics (6 papers), SRELS Journal of Information Management (6 papers) and http:/eprints.rclis.org/archive/(open access archives) (6 papers). Tripathi a and Garg (2016), have explored He used 65 communication channels to disseminate the results of his research of which Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Sciences (11 papers) tops of the list followed by Annals of Library and Information Studies (7 papers), Scientometrics (6 papers), SRELS Journal of Information Management (6 papers) and http:/eprints.rclis.org/archive/(open access archives) (6 papers).Susanta Koley and B K Sen (2016) have analysed the mean collaborative Index was 3.5; mean degree of collaboration was 0.89; mean collaborative coefficient was 0.6119 and mean modified collaborative coefficient was 0.6121 during the period of study. Forty one authors have contributed more than one percent of the total publication. Ten journals have contributed more than one percent of the total papers. Among these 'Journal of Forensic & Legal Medicine' ranks first with 16.10% papers. Cluster map of co-words was also created using VOSviewer. John Jeyasekar and Saravanan (2015) have examined_This paper discusses about the published research articles and their citations available in the Indian Citation Index by the authors from University of Madras. The relevant data are collected from Indian Citation Index and it was further analyzed. It shows, the 538 articles includes 480(89.22%) Research Articles, 19(3.53%) short communication and 10 (1.86%) articles each from Review articles and Case Studies. Uma and Dhanavandan (2015) have studied The top 10 most productive countries share of international collaborative papers in nasal polyps varied from 6.25% to 53.70% during 2004-13, with highest share coming from Belgium, followed by UK, China, Germany,

Italy, USA, Japan, South Korea, India and Turkey during 2004-13. The average productivity per organization, average citation impact per publication, h-index and share of international collaborative publications of the top 15 most productive global organizations were 46, 8.99, 16.67 and 28.70%, respectively during 2004-13. Gupta, Kiran Baidwani and Ritu Gupta (2015) have discussed the n different parameters like year-wise distribution of articles for the period of study (1991-2012), length of articles, authorship pattern of contributions, author productivity, degree of collaboration among co-authors and gender-wise distribution of papers. Malathy and Kantha (2015) have analysed profiles 15 most productive countries in rare earths, 20 most productive organizations and 20 most productive authors on a series of indicators including global publications share, global citation share, average productivity, citations per paper, h-index, and share of international collaborative papers during 2005-14. Dhawan, Gupta and Ritu Gupta (2016) have studied 236 publications that were extracted from Web of Science Database as well as Institute Annual reports. The publication data were analyzed on various parameters like, publication trend, highly cited papers, most prolific authors, collaborative authorship pattern and trends, the degree of author's collaboration and preferred journals for scholarly communication and so on. The most preferred journal for publication by CSIR-NEERI scientists is Environmental monitoring and assessment. Rajesh Kumar Lohiya, and Jiji Cyriac. (2016) have examined 2376 articles were published during the period, initially with 100-150 articles per year to 488 and 891 during 2014 and 2015. Also, the number of references cited per article and average pages per article had increased to 35.01 references and 7.02 pages per article respectively during 2015. A steady increase in number of citations was observed for the articles published during the period 2010-2014 with the highest citation counts of 640 during 2015. Shankar Reddy Kollean and Shankarappa (2016) have studied The growth of research activity in IIT Bombay in terms of PhD theses is analyzed for the period of 1958-2015 using data from Annual Reports, Library Catalogue, Electronic Theses and Dissertations of IIT Bombay. Data related to 4, 268 PhDs awarded during the period have been analysed to identify active departments, supervisors, research collaboration, and topics based on high frequency keywords; Keyword visualization map is generated using VOS Viewer software. The study is intended to provide useful information to policy makers and funding agencies. Manju Naika , Satish Kanamadi , Anil Sutar and Jayadev Kadli. (2016) have analysed the most preferred journals were the International Pigeonpea Newsletter with 272 papers (7.69%) followed by Indian Journal of Agronomy with 214 papers (6.05%). The study revealed that Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences, Indian Journal of Pulses Research, Journal of Maharashtra Agricultural Universities contributed 415 papers (11.72%) of Indian research output on Pigeonpea Pulse Crop. Rajendran (2016) has analysed a high degree of research/ authorship collaboration (.9472) on Azadirachta indica was found. All except 05.28% articles were works of joint authorship. Author productivity considering first author as well as all authors did not fit Lotka's law with a value of n=2. The distribution of articles in journals was found nearly acceptable to the Bradford's law of scattering making it obvious that there are a few core journals contributing significantly on Azadirachta indica. Nirmal Singh (2016) has reported the Scientometric analysis of paper that have been cited at least 2000 times, their citation counts in 2015 and average citations per year and subject category are computed The major collaborating countries, their total papers and their citation counts were also investigated. The most productive journals and their citation counts and the most prolific authors with at least 50 papers are identified. Subramanyam , Krishnamurthy and Asundi (2016) have discussed the growth of research work in the field of social sciences and humanities in Odisha during the period 1996 to 2015. The present study analyzes the year wise growth of publications, most productive authors, major subject areas of research, types of publications preferred by the researchers, preferred journals and the major productive institutions in the field of social

science and humanities. Baskaran (2015), has examined the confront the publications output trend among USA scientists, Wang Y has secured top level as measured 0.226%. USA scientists have contributed totally 15832 (30.815%) items and include 87.947% percent are appeared as journal articles. Harvard University scientists are much attention in produced large number of research papers and they hold top level among research collaboration in enzyme research.Sivakami and Baskaran (2016), have examined the Swine Flu is that, unlike seasonal flu, which is typically most dangerous to the very young, elderly and those with a weakened immune system. By keeping this in mind the researcher intends to study the research productivity of Swine Flu. A total of 64030 records were obtained from MEDLINE databases have been taken for this study. Baskaran (2016) has explored the relative growth rate and doubling time of Bioinformatics Publication during 1999 - 2013. The mean relative growth was measures and doubling time observed from the analysis. The highest publication published in Bioinformatics journal and Harvard University scientists contributed highest number of publication in the study RGR and DT is exhibits that fluctuating trend happening whole period of study. Imran Khan (2016) analysed that an observation of the scientometrci publications of 307 contributions in the five volumes from the year 2010 to 2014. Maximum number of contribution/ research papers were found to be published in the year 2012. A maximum number of contributions are from India with a total of 273 (88.93%). Majority authors preferred Journals as their major source of information, providing the highest number of citations totaling 2447 (51.89%). The maximum citations totaling 1109 (23.52%) out of 4716 were received in the year 2013. Ramesh Babu and Baskaran (2017) have analyzed the highest out of Forensic Medicine research Forensic Medicine research in 2013 was 447 (11.05 %) of the publications, followed by 420 (10.38%) of the publication brought out in 2015. The doubling time for pages of the publications of web of Science record witnessed that an increasing and suddenly It can be analysed that highest dt is observed 13.86 in 002 and it seems that lowest value of Dt is 0.32 in 2015.

Objectives of the study

1.To analyse the Year-wise distribution of the publications of DJLIT

2. To measure the Relative Growth Rate (RGR) and Doubling time (Dt) of the DJLIT

3. To find out the Form of distribution of papers published from DJLIT

4. To calculate the Authorship pattern and author Collaboration of the publications

5. To analyse the ranking of authors and Institutions of the publications

6. To observe the Geographical distribution of the DJLIT publications

7. To examine the Length of papers and citation references of the publications of DJLIT.

Methodology

The present study examines the publications growth, author productivity, Collaboration and other appropriate analysis was taken to the analysis on DESIDOC Journal of Library and Information Technology (DJLIT). The search the bibliographical detail retrieved from complete records of papers published by LIS Teachers and researchers from around the world. It can be seen that nearly 419 bibliographic records of DJLIT publications over the

period of 7 years (i.e.) 2011–2017. The study finds the result on the analysis of year-wise growth, author productivity, authorship pattern, measured using Scientometric indicators such as collaborative index (CI), collaborative coefficient, modified collaborative co-efficient etc. Further , the study determine the research papers appear on quantum of pages and citations references were accounted and tabulated in the study.

Analysis and Interpretations

Year-wise distribution of the paper

DESIDOC Journal of Library and Information Technology published the research papers during 2011–2011, total number of 419 records, with an average publication per year as 60. Table 1 shows maximum of 70 (16.70%) of the papers were brought out in the year 2012. It followed by 66 (15.75%) of the papers published in 2013. The study found that DJLIT productivity range of publications between 12.17 % and 16.70 % in the year 2016 and 2012 respectively (Fig.1).

Table 1 Year-wise distribution of the paper

Year	V. No	No. of Issue	No. of papers	%
2011	31	6	58	13.84
2012	32	6	70	16.70
2013	33	6	66	15.75
2014	34	6	63	15.03
2015	35	6	53	12.64
2016	36	6	51	12.17
2017	37	6	58	13.84
		Total no.	**419**	

Relative Growth Rate (RGR) and Doubling time (dt) of the publications

The growth of DJLIT publications were analysed by 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. Table 2 observed that year-wise analysis of the DJLIT distribution, RGR, Dt, and mean of RGR and Dt during the period 2011–2011. Fig.2, exhibits the RGR and Dt was an increasing and a decreasing trend observed over period of study. It is found that highest RGR was 0.18 in 2012 and lowest RGR was 0.04 known in two years 2014 and 2016 it could be observed RGR and Dt went on exponential growth were does not progress during the period. When it was made a analysis against highest RGR was 0.18, similarly 0.25 in 2012. Further, the lowest RGR was found to be 0.04, whereas Dt was 0.05 in 2016. An average RGR and Dt are corresponding 0.08 and 0.13 respectively of the DJLIT publications over the period of study.

Table 2 Relative Growth Rate (RGR) and Doubling time (dt) of the publications

Year	Vol.No	No. of output	W1	W3	RGR	Dt
2011	31	58	0	4.06	0	0
2012	32	70	4.06	4.24	0.18	0.25
2013	33	66	4.24	4.18	0.06	0.12
2014	34	63	4.18	4.14	0.04	0.05
2015	35	53	4.14	3.97	0.17	0.24
2016	36	51	3.97	3.93	0.04	0.05
2017	37	58	3.93	4.06	0.13	0.18
		419			**0.08**	**0.13**

Distribution of the contribution of the publications

DJLIT presents the growth of records analysed Volume Number and Issue Number wise publications between 31 and 37 during 2011 and 2017. Table 3 shows volume no. 31 holds the highest 14 papers in issue no. 4 , it followed by volume no. 32 hold with 13 papers published at issue no. 3 and 4. It is analysed that there were quantum 10 papers published by eleven times at different volumes and issues. Further, it could be found that lowest analysis was 7 found in volume no. 36 and Issue no. 2.

Table 3 Distribution and contribution of the publications

Issue	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	Total
1	8	11	13	9	9	8	9	67
2	9	11	10	12	8	7	10	67
3	7	13	10	11	10	9	11	71
4	14	13	12	10	10	9	9	77
5	10	12	9	10	8	10	10	69
6	10	10	12	11	8	8	9	68
Total	58	70	66	63	53	51	58	419

Source-wise distribution of the Publications

DJLIT brought out the publications on the form of editorial, research papers, Book, review and Index/short communication. Table 4 presents the research papers contributed in DJLIT, the editorial holds maximum of 12 papers in consecutively three times in issue no. 3,4 and 5 of volume no. 12. The highest research papers hold 12 in issue no.1 (volume 33). There were nine times research papers published 10 publications during the study period. Book reviews and Index/Sort communications were published 9 and 8 respectively corresponding to the study.

Table 4 Source-wise distribution of the Publications

Year	V.No	I.No	Editorial	Research papers	Book Review	Index/Sort Communication	Total
2011	31	1	0	7	1	0	8
		2	1	7	1	0	9
		3	0	7	0	0	7
		4	1	10	2	1	14
		5	1	9	0	0	10
		6	0	10	0	0	10
2012	32	1	10	0	0	0	**10**
		2	11	0	1	0	12
		3	12	0	0	0	12
		4	12	0	1	0	13
		5	12	0	0	0	12
		6	10	0	1	0	**11**
2013	33	1	1	12	0	0	13
		2	1	9	0	0	10
		3	1	9	0	0	10
		4	0	11	0	0	11
		5	0	9	0	0	9
		6	0	11	0	1	11
2014	34	1	0	9	0	0	9
		2	1	11	0	0	12
		3	1	10	0	0	11
		4	0	10	0	0	10
		5	0	10	0	0	10
		6	1	10	0	0	11
2015	35	1	0	9	0	0	9
		2	0	8	0	0	8
		3	1	9	0	0	10
		4	0	10	0	0	10
		5	0	8	0	0	8
		6	0	8	0	0	8
2016	36	1	0	8	0	2	10
		2	0	8	0	0	8
		3	1	7	0	0	8
		4	0	8	0	0	8
		5	1	9	0	0	10
		6	0	9	0	0	9
2017	37	1	0	8	1	0	9
		2	0	9	1	0	10
		3	0	10	0	1	11
		4	0	9	0	0	9
		5	0	10	0	0	10
		6	0	9	0	0	9

Total	**79**	**327**	**9**	**5**	**419**

Authorship pattern of DJLIT

DJLIT publications were contributed among the Library and Information Science researchers during 2011-2017. Table 5 presents the authorship pattern of the DJLIT publications of those 36.75 % of the publications shared single author. 63.25 % of the publications contributed in collaborative nature. It is observed that majority of publications 44.15 % representing by the two authors in the analysis. Further, it is found that below ten % of publications 4.53 and 2.63% reported by four and five and authors respectively during the period of study.

Table 5 Authorship pattern of DJLIT

Year	Vol.No	Issue No.	Single	Two	Three	Four	Five and above	Total
2011	31	1	3	3	0	0	0	6
		2	5	4	2	1	0	12
		3	5	5	1	1	0	12
		4	5	5	0	0	0	10
		5	3	4	1	0	0	8
		6	5	3	1	0	1	10
2012	32	1	5	5	2	1	0	13
		2	6	6	0	0	0	12
		3	5	5	2	0	0	12
		4	4	4	1	0	0	9
		5	5	5	2	0	0	12
		6	5	5	1	0	1	12
2013	33	1	5	6	0	0	0	11
		2	5	3	0	0	0	8
		3	5	2	1	2	0	10
		4	4	6	3	2	0	15
		5	3	6	1	2	0	12
		6	5	3	0	2	0	10
2014	34	1	1	4	3	1	0	9
		2	4	8	0	0	0	12
		3	4	1	3	3	0	11
		4	2	5	2	1	0	10
		5	3	7	0	0	0	10
		6	7	2	2	0	0	11
2015	35	1	1	7	1	0	1	10
		2	1	4	0	1	1	7
		3	3	3	2	0	1	9
		4	4	3	1	0	2	10
		5	3	2	3	0	1	9
		6	3	3	1	0	1	8
2016	36	1	3	4	1	0	0	8
		2	4	3	1	0	0	8

		3	5	3	0	0	0	8
		4	3	4	2	1	0	10
		5	2	4	3	0	0	9
		6	2	4	1	0	1	8
2017	37	1	2	6	0	0	0	8
		2	3	6	1	0	0	10
		3	2	6	1	0	0	9
		4	4	4	1	0	0	9
		5	4	8	0	1	1	14
		6	1	4	3	0	0	8
Total			**154 (36.75%)**	**185 (44.15%)**	**50 (11.93%)**	**19 (4.53%)**	**11 (2.62%)**	**419**

Author Collaboration

CI by Lawani (1980) explained that proportion of multiple authored papers, called Degree of Collaboration (DC) by Subramanyam (1983) it was measured of the strength of collaboration in a discipline. Assuming that these two measures were seems to be inadequate, Ajiferuke et al. (1988), explained that a single measure that incorporates some of the merits of both of the above. Ideally, it is desired that a quantification of collaboration should have a value between 0 and 1, with 0 corresponding to single authored papers, and 1 for the case where all papers are maximally authored, i.e. every publication in the collection has all authors in the collection as co-authors. All the above mentioned formulas to find the collaboration coefficient (CC) value have one or other demerit. The study also proposed different measure has been taken place in terms of modification of CC, and Modified Collaboration Coefficient (MCC) are derived as,

The measures of DC and CI are given by:

$$CI = \frac{\sum^{A}_{J-1\ ifj}}{N}$$

DC is measure that f multiple authored productivity calculate as,

$$DC = 1 - \frac{f1}{N}$$

CC as measured alternatively into CI and DC as follows,

$$CC = 1 - \sum^{A}_{J-1\ ifj}$$

$$\frac{}{N}$$

The derivation of the new measure found to be that almost the equal proportion of CC, as given in Ajiferuke et al. (1988). The above equation is not defined for the trivial case when A = 1, the problems , since collaboration is meaningless unless at least two authors are available. CC appears MCC only when A ? , but is otherwise strictly less than MCC by the factor 1 1 A (Savanur and Srikanth,2010)

$$MCC = \frac{A}{A-1} = \frac{\sum^{A}_{J-1} (1/J)\, fj}{N}$$

From the 22,765 articles 39 articles are authored more than 26 authors. Overall the 96% of the articles are collaborative like the other disciplines.

Table 6 Author Collaboration

Year	Single	Two	Three	Four	Five	> Five	Total	CI	DC	CC	MCC
2011	26	24	5	2	0	1	58	71.156	0.843	0.516	0.484
2012	30	30	8	1	0	1	70	88.125	0.875	0.416	0.584
2013	27	26	5	8	0	0	66	105.094	0.907	0.316	0.684
2014	21	27	10	5	0	0	63	122.063	0.939	0.216	0.784
2015	15	22	8	1	0	7	53	139.032	0.971	0.116	0.884
2016	19	22	8	1	0	1	51	156.001	1.003	0.016	0.984
2017	16	34	6	1	0	1	58	172.97	1.035	-0.084	1.084
Total	154	185	50	19	0	11	419	189.939	1.067	-0.184	1.184

Table 6 shows the analysis made that highest CI was 172.97 the year 20167, followed by the year 2016(156), 2015 (139.03), 1998 (4.2140), 2014 (122.06), 2013 (105.09), 2012 (88.12) and 2011 (71.15). It is observed that the highest DC was 1.03 in the year 2017, it followed by 1 (2016). It is reported that highest CC was 0.516 (2011) , it followed by 0.416 (2012). There was calculated a MCC 1.084 (2017) and 0.984 (2016) is identified in fig-3.

Ranking of authors contributed in DJLIT

DJLIT publications were brought out by the popular researchers in terms they contributed the quality nature of their productivity. Table 7 presents the highest papers and minimum quantity of the publications with cut short of 3. There were listed top twenty authors of those BM. Guptha was published 18 papers in DJLIT, who is a ranked 1 author. It followed by Chenupathi K. Ramiah shored second his publications 11. It is found remaining of 18 authors was published below 10 publications among the twenty authors.

Table 7 Ranking of authors contributed in DJLIT

Name of the author	Contributions	Rank
B.M Gupta	18	1
Chenupathi K.Ramiah	11	2
Adarsh Bala	8	3
BS.Kademani	6	4
K. Bhanumurthy	6	5
KC. Garg	6	6
Shri Ram	6	7
K. Nageshwararao	6	8
Margam Madhusudhan	6	9
Rajendra Kumbhar	5	10
Partiba A. Gokhale	5	11
Ritu Gupta	5	12
Muhammed Haneefa.K	5	13
Shalini R. Lihitkar	5	14
Avinash Kshitij	4	15
Paramjeet Kaur Walia	4	16
S. Thanushkodi	4	17
Sunilkumar Satpathy	4	18
VG Talwar	4	19
Nidhi sandal	3	20

Ranking of the Institutions

Table 8 describes that DJLIT publications made by the researchers by the institutions, there are listed forty five institutions ranked in the study. It is observed majority of 28 publications brought out from University of Delhi, which is the top ranked institution. It is followed by NISTADS (24), DRDO (22), Pondicherry University (13), Banaras Hindu University (11) , Indian Institute of technology (11) and University of Kashmir (10). The study could be found that remaining of 71.51% of the publications brought out by the authors published less than 10.

Table 8 Ranking of the Institutions

S.No	Name of the Institution	No. of Papers	Rank
1	University of Delhi	28	1
2	National Institute of science Technology and Development Studies (NISTADS)	24	2
3	Defence Research Development Organization(DRDO)	22	3
4	Pondicherry University	13	4
5	Banaras Hindu University	11	5
6	Indian Institute of Technology	11	5
7	University of Kashmir	10	6

8	Bhabha Atomic Research Centre	9	7
9	Manipal University	8	8
10	Panjab University	7	9
11	Karnatak University	7	9
12	Jawaharlal Nehru University	6	10
13	Birla Institute of Management & Technology	6	10
14	Guru Nanak Dev University	5	11
15	Indira Gandhi Natioanl Open University	5	11
16	National Institute of Technology	5	11
17	National Institute of Science Communication and Information Resources	5	11
18	University of Kerala	5	11
19	University of Pune	5	11
20	University of Mysore	5	11
21	University of Mumbai	5	11
22	University of Lagos	4	12
23	University of Calicut	4	12
24	Tata Institute of Social Sciences	4	12
25	Savitribai Phule Pune University	4	12
26	North Eastern Hill University	4	12
27	King Saud University	4	12
28	Kuvempu University	4	12
29	Jaypee University of Information Technology	4	12
30	Indian Statistical Institute	4	12
31	Government Medical College & Hospital	4	12
32	Covenant University	4	12
33	Baba Farid University of Health Sciences	4	12
34	Banasthali University	3	13
35	BGSB University	3	13
36	Fiji National University	3	13
37	Guru Ghasidas University	3	13
38	Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research	3	13
39	Mangalore University	3	13
40	Mizoram University	3	13
41	Nagpur University	3	13
42	Nanyang Technological University	3	13
43	University of Calcutta	3	13
44	University of Dhaka	3	13
45	University of Madras	3	13

Geographical Distribution of DJLIT

Table 9 presents the DJLIT corresponding that authors those concern with an institutions locate the geographical places identified. There are listed thirty five places, the maximum of 62 papers contributed from the institutions in New Delhi. It followed by Delhi (38), Mumbai (25), Bangalore (19), Hyderabad (19), Pune (15), Chandigarh (14), and Varanasi (13) and Pudhucherry (12). Further, It is observed that 48.21% of publications corresponding to the places where belongs the institutions with less than 10.

Table 9 Geographical Distribution of DJLIT

S.No	Name of the place	Nos.	%
1	New Delhi	62	14.79
2	Delhi	38	9.06
3	Mumbai	25	5.96
4	Bangalore	19	4.53
5	Hyderabad	19	4.53
6	Pune	15	3.51
7	Chandigarh	14	3.34
8	Varanasi	13	3.10
9	Pudhucherry	12	2.86
10	Nagpur	9	2.14
11	Srinagar	9	2.14
12	Bhubaneswar	8	1.90
13	Dharwad	8	1.67
14	Thiruvananthapuram	7	1.67
15	Nigeria	7	1.43
16	Kolkata	6	1.43
17	Patiala	6	1.43
18	Rajasthan	6	1.19
19	Rajouri	5	1.19
20	Mysore	5	1.19
21	Manipal,	5	0.95
22	Lucknow	4	0.95
23	Visakhapatnam	4	0.95
24	**Ahmedabad**	3	0.71
25	Aizawl	3	0.71
26	Aligarh	3	0.71
27	Amritsar	3	0.71
28	Faridkot	3	0.71
29	Kharagpur	3	0.71
30	Mangalore	3	0.71
31	Ranchi	3	0.71
32	Sambalpur	3	0.71
33	Shillong	3	0.71
34	Solan	3	0.71

35	Tirupathi	3	0.71
36	Other Places	342	81.62

Distribution of the Special Issue of DJLIT

DJLIT brought out the publications from different specialization of the areas over the period of study. Table 10 presents maximum of publications appeared in Volume no 31 (Issue no 5) covered maximum of 8 papers in the Special issue of Scientometrics. Volume no 32 (Issue no.1 &5) containing of 8 papers brought out in Agricultural Information Systems and services in India and Open Software Libraries. Volume no. 33 (Issue no.4) 8 papers covered on Knowledge organization. Volume no. 34 (Issue no.3) 10 papers contributed from Knowledge organization. Volume no. 35 (Issue no.4) 5 papers. Volume no. 36&37 (Issue no. 3&1) brought out maximum of 7 papers from Marketing

Table 10 Distribution of the Special Issue of DJLIT

Year	Vol	Issue	No of Papers	Name of the Special Issue
2011	31	2	5	Ontology
	31	4	7	Semantic Web
	31	5	8	Scientometrics
2012	32	1	8	Agricultural Information Systems and Services in India
	32	2	6	E-Books
	32	3	7	Intellectual Property Rights
	32	4	7	Digital Preservation
	32	5	8	Open Source Software for Libraries
2013	33	1	7	Corporate Social Responsibility and Public Libraries
	33	2	6	Health Information Systems and Services
	33	3	7	Applications of Online Exhibitions
	33	4	8	Knowledge Organisation
2014	34	2	4	Trends in Online Exhibitions
	34	3	10	Indian Contribution in Scientometrics
	34	6	4	Embedded Librarianship: Changing Role of Librarian in Digital Age
2015	35	3	4	Libraries and Librarianship: Status, Issues and Trends
	35	4	5	Libraries and Librarianship in India: Status, Information Technology Applications and Trends Part II
2016	36	3	7	Marketing and Public Relations in Libraries
	36	5	6	Libraries and Social Media Networks

2017	37	1	7	Library & Information Science Education

Citations references of DJLIT

The citations recorded there were used on their publications in terms of highly impact of the journals and specific relevant on the study. Table 11 describes the highest 1109 (16.77%) of the citations out of 66 publications in 2013. It followed by 1051 (15.89%), 988(14.94%), 983(14.86%) 936(14.15%), 792(11.98%) and 752 (11.37%) of the Citations applied out 419 publications in the year 2017, 2011,2012,2014,2015 and 2016 respectively.

Table 11 Citations references of DJLIT

Year	No. of output	No. of citation references	%
2011	58	988	14.94
2012	70	983	14.86
2013	66	1109	16.77
2014	63	936	14.15
2015	53	792	11.98
2016	51	752	11.37
2017	58	1051	15.89
Total	**419**	**6611**	

Length of article references of the publications

Table 12 observed that length of article of the DJLIT publications out of 419 papers contributed during the period of study. It is analysed that maximum 277 (66.10%) of the publications covered the pages between 6and 10. It followed by 90 (21.47%) of the publications represented the pages between 1and 4, which less than 44.63% of the publication of the pages between 6 and 10. 10.97% of the publications combined pages between 11 and 15. Further, the results observed that only the single digit 1.19 and 0.23% of the publications published between 16 and 20 , above 20 pages respectively during the study period.

Table 12 Length of article references of the publications

Year	Vol. No	Issue. No	1TO 5	6 To 10	11 To 15	16 To 20	above 20	Total
2011	31	1	1	5	1	1	0	8
		2	2	4	3	0	0	9
		3	2	4	1	0	0	7
		4	3	9	1	1	0	14
		5	3	6	1	0	0	10
		6	2	6	1	1	0	10
2012	32	1	2	9	1	0	0	12
		2	3	7	0	0	1	11

		3	3	9	1	0	0	13
		4	4	9	1	0	0	14
		5	5	7	1	0	0	13
		6	1	7	2	0	0	10
2013	33	1	7	5	1	0	0	13
		2	6	4	1	0	0	11
		3	1	6	2	1	0	10
		4	3	7	2	0	0	12
		5	1	7	1	0	0	9
		6	3	8	1	0	0	12
2014	34	1	2	5	2	0	0	9
		2	2	8	2	0	0	12
		3	1	9	1	1	0	12
		4	2	8	1	0	0	11
		5	2	8	1	0	0	11
		6	4	7	2	0	0	13
2015	35	1	0	7	1	0	0	8
		2	0	7	2	0	0	9
		3	0	4	0	0	0	4
		4	1	5	0	0	0	6
		5	2	6	1	0	0	9
		6	2	6	1	0	0	9
2016	36	1	1	6	1	0	0	8
		2	2	3	2	0	0	7
		3	3	3	2	0	0	8
		4	3	5	1	0	0	9
		5	2	6	1	0	0	9
		6	0	08	1	0	0	9
2017	37	1	2	7	1	0	0	10
		2	2	7	0	0	0	9
		3	1	10	0	0	0	11
		4	2	6	1		0	9
		5	1	9	0	0	0	10
		6	1	8	0	0	0	9
Total			**90**	**277**	**46**	**5**	**1**	**419**

Major findings

- Maximum of 70 papers were brought out in the year 2012. It followed by 66 papers published in 2013. The study found that DJLIT productivity range of publications between 12.17 and 16.76 over the period of study.
- RGR and Dt was an increasing and a decreasing trend observed over period of study. It is found that highest RGR was 0.18 in 2012 and lowest RGR was 0.04 known in

two years 2014 and 2016 it could be observed RGR and Dt went on exponential growth were does not progress during the period.

- the highest 14 papers in issue no. 4 , it followed by volume no. 32 hold with 13 papers published at issue no. 3 and 4. It is analysed that there were quantum 10 papers published by eleven times at different volumes and issues.
- Maximum of 12 papers in consecutively three times appeared from issue no. 3,4 and 5 of volume no. 12. The highest research papers hold 12 in issue no.1 (volume 33). There were nine times research papers published 10 publications during the study period.
- 36.75 % of the publications shared single author. 63.25 % of the publications contributed in collaborative nature. It is observed that majority of publications 44.15 % representing by the two authors in the analysis.
- Highest CI was 172.97 the year 20167, followed by the year 2016(156), 2015 (139.03), 1998 (4.2140), 2014 (122.06), 2013 (105.09), 2012 (88.12) and 2011 (71.15). It is observed that the highest DC was 1.03 in the year 2017, it followed by 1 (2016). It is reported that highest CC was 0.516 (2011).
- BM. Guptha was published 18 papers in DJLIT, who is a ranked 1 author. It followed by Chenupathi K. Ramiah shored second his publications 11.
- University of Delhi, which is the top ranked institution. It is followed by NISTADS (24), DRDO (22), Pondicherry University (13), Banaras Hindu University (11) , Indian Institute of technology (11) and University of Kashmir (10).
- Maximum of 62 papers contributed from the institutions in New Delhi. It followed by Delhi (38), Mumbai (25).
- Maximum of publications appeared from Volume no 31 (Issue no 5) covered maximum of 8 papers in the Special issue of Scientometrics. Volume no 32 (Issue no.1 &5) containing of 8 papers brought out in Agricultural Information Systems and services in India and Open Software Libraries.
- Highest 1109 (16.77%) of the citations out of 66 publications in 2013. It is analysed that maximum 277 (66.10%) of the publications covered the pages between 6and 10. It followed by 90 (21.47%).

Conclusion

The study analysis the growth of publications on research output DJLIT publications during 2011-2017. The researcher was dealt with parameters of the Scientometrics applied to the study. The Library and information Science and other Social Science Researchers more interested on contributing their research output in the DJLIT publications. DJLIT journal is top ranked journal in LIS India and global as well. The journal is being taken the research papers double blind review by the well experienced researchers from across the Globe. The higher education institution ordered by various combinations of various factors. Rankings have most often been conducted by magazines, newspapers, websites, governments, or academics. In addition to ranking entire institutions, organizations perform rankings of specific programs, departments, and schools. Various rankings consider combinations of measures of funding and endowment, research excellence and/or influence, specialization

expertise, admissions, student options, award numbers, internationalization, graduate employment, industrial linkage, historical reputation and other criteria. The study is being considered various rankings mostly evaluating on institutional output by research. Some rankings evaluate institutions within a single country, while others assess institutions worldwide. The subject has produced much debate about rankings' usefulness and accuracy. The institutions ranking can be measured an expanding diversity in rating methodologies and accompanying criticisms of each indicate the lack of consensus in the field. The variety of academic rankings provides a comprehensive overview and insightful overlook of different academic institutions on composite capabilities in academia. Whilst United Nations advocates for the beneficial role that higher education could be the common good of social leverage and educating skills to equip everyone participated, yet college ranking is a transparent tool for a fair evaluation for the public.

References

Ajiferuke, I, Burrel,q and Tague, J. (1988). Collaborative coefficient: A single measure of the degree of collaboration in research, Scientometrics, 14, 421-433

Baskaran, C (2015). Research productivity of enzymes literature: A Scientometric study. International Journal of Library Science and Information Management, 1 (2), 17-25.

Baskaran, C. (2016). A Scientometric study on Bioinformatics literature during 1999 -2013. International Journal of Library Science and Information Management , 2 (4) , ,62-71.

Belikov, A.V and Belikov, V.V. (2015). A Citation-based, author- and age-normalized, logarithmic index for evaluation of individual researchers independently of publication counts. F1000Research, 4:884. doi:10.12688/f1000research.7070.1.

De Solla Price, D. (1978). Editorial statement. Scientometrics, 1 (1).

Dhawan, SM, B. M. Gupta and Ritu Gupta. (2016). Scientometric Assessment of Indian Publications on Rare Earths during 2005-14, SRELS Journal of Information Management, 53(4), 10.17821/srels/2016/v53i4/97246.

DJLIT website page accessed at https://publications.drdo.gov.in/ojs/index.php/djlit

Gupta, BM, Kiran Baidwani and Ritu Gupta. (2015). Global Assessment of Nasal Polyps Research: A Scientometric Analysis of Publications during 2004-13. SRELS Journal of Information Management, 52(2), DOI: http://www.srels.org/index.php/sjim/article/view/61944.

Imran Khan (2016). A Scientometric analysis of DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology (2010-2014), Library Hi-Tech News, 33(7), 8-12, http://doi.org/10.1108/LHTN-03-2016-0014

India as seen through SCOPUS database during 1965-2010. Annals of Library and Information Studies, 63(3), 222-231.

John Jeyasekar, J and Saravanan, P. (2015). Indian Forensic Science Research Literature: A Bibliometric Study of its Growth, Authorship and Publication Patterns. SRELS Journal of Information Management, 52(1). DOI 10.17821/srels/2015/v52i1/58772.

Lawani, S.M. (1980). Quality Collaboration and citations in cancer research : A bibliometric study, Ph.D Dissertation,Florida State University, 39.

Leydesdorff, L & Milojevic, S. Scientometrics arXiv:1208.4566 (2013), forthcoming in: Lynch, M. (editor), International Encyclopaedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences subsection. 8503.

Lowry. (2004). Paul Benjamin, Romans, Denton; Curtis, Aaron. Global journal prestige and supporting disciplines: A Scientometric study of information systems journals. Journal of the Association for Information Systems, 5 (2), 29–80. SSRN 666145,2004.

Lowry, Paul Benjamin, Moody, Gregory D, Gaskin, James, Galletta, Dennis F, Humpherys, Sean Barlow, Jordan B and Wilson, David W. (2013). "Evaluating journal quality and the Association for Information Systems (AIS) Senior Scholars' journal basket via Bibliometric measures: Do expert journal assessments add value?," MIS Quarterly (MISQ), 37(4), 993–1012.

Mahapatra, M., 1985. On the Validity of the Theory of Exponential Growth of Scientific Literature: Proceedings of the 15th IASLIC Conference, Bangalore, pp 61 -70.

Malathy , S & Kantha, P . "Journal of Spacecraft Technology: A Bibliometric Study, SRELS Journal of Information Management, 52(1), DOI http://www.srels.org/index.php/sjim/article/view/61969.

Manju Naika and Satish Kanamadi, Anil Sutar & Jayadev Kadli. (2016). A Scientometric Analysis of the Doctoral Theses Submitted to Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, SRELS Journal of Information Management, 53(5), DOI: 10.17821/srels/2016/v53i5/102354.

Nirmal Singh. (2016). Scientific Output on Azadirachta indica (Neem): A Bibliometric Study. SRELS Journal of Information Management, 53(6), DOI: 10.17821/srels/2016/v53i6/87019.

Rajendran, L. (2016). Indian Contribution to Pigeonpea (Cajanus cajan) Pulse Crop Research: A Scientometric Analysis, SRELS Journal of Information Management, 53(6), DOI: 10.17821/srels/2016/v53i6/99422.

Rajesh Kumar Lohiya, K. P. S. Sengar and Jiji Cyriac. (2016). Research Performance of CSIR-NEERI, Nagpur during 1989-2013: A Scientometric Study, SRELS Journal of Information Management, 53(4), 10.17821/srels/2016/v53i4/95460.

Ramesh Babu, P and Baskaran, C. (2017). Research Pattern on Forensic Medicine in Global Output: A Scientometric Analysis. International Journal of Library Science and Information Management , 3(1), 53-64.

Savanur Kiran and Srikanth, 2010. Modified collaborative coefficient: a new measure for quantifying the degree of research collaboration, Scientometrics, 84(2), 365-371

Shankar Reddy Kolle and Shankarappa, TH. (2016). Scientometric Analysis of Scientific Papers from India (1989-2015) based on WoS Data. SRELS Journal of Information Management, 53(6), DOI:10.17821/srels/2016/v53i6/90091.

Shankar Reddy Kolle and T. H. Shankarappa. (2016). Journal of Food Science and Technology:A Web of Science Based Bibliometric Analysis (2006-2015). SRELS Journal of Information Management, 53(4), DOI: 10.17821/srels/2016/v53i4/86634.

Sivakami, N and C. Baskaran. (2016). Time series analysis of swine flu literature during 1991-2013. International Journal of Library Science and Information Management, 2 (1), 38-46.

Subramayam K. (1982). Bibliometric study of research collaboration: A review, Journal of Information Science , 6, 33-38.

Subramanyam, N and Krishnamurthy, M. (2017). IndMed : An Evaluative Study on the Coverage of Indian Medical Literature. SRELS Journal of Information Management, 54(1), DOI**:** 10.17821/srels/2017/v54i1/101184.

Susanta Koley and B K Sen. (2016). BioBibliometric portrait of V L Kalyane, a stellar bioBibliometric ian. Annals of Library and Information Studies, 63(3), 161-175

Uma, V and Dhanavandan, S. (2015). An Exploration and Mapping of Research Performance, Productivity and Citations. SRELS Journal of Information Management, 52(1), 10.17821/srels/2015/v52i1/58775.