TULSSAA journal

Vol. 12 No 1 Issue 15, March 2025

DOI- https://doi.org/10.3126/tulssaa.v12i1.77248

TULSSAA, Nepal

Enhancing Research Visibility: Analyzing Anesthesia Faculty at AIIMS, New Delhi, on Google Scholar

Umesh Kumar

Research Scholar, Department of Library and Information Science, University of Delhi

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4240-0972

Madhusudhan Margam*

Professor, Department of Library and Information Science, University of Delhi

Email: madhumargam@gmail.com

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1174-2099

(*Corresponding Author)

Abstract

Research visibility is crucial in enhancing a researcher's academic recognition, accessibility, and impact. This study examines the research productivity and scholarly influence of faculty members in the Anesthesia Department at AIIMS, New Delhi, using Google Scholar metrics, including total publications, citation count, h-index, and i10-index. Among the 48 faculty members, only 27 have a Google Scholar profile, and just 12 have integrated a verified email ID, indicating limited adoption of the platform for academic visibility. The analysis of scholarly output reveals that Associate Professor Dr Anju Gupta has the highest number of publications (532). At the same time, Additional Professor Dr Souvik Maitra leads in citations (5,969), h-index (33), and i10-index (66), reflecting a strong research influence. Mid-career

faculty members, particularly additional and associate professors, demonstrate higher engagement in research, while senior professors appear to focus more on mentorship and administrative responsibilities. The study also highlights gender representation in research, with female faculty members making substantial contributions. The findings emphasize the need for increased institutional support and awareness regarding the benefits of Google Scholar to enhance research visibility, foster collaboration, and strengthen the department's academic impact.

Keywords: *Research visibility, Research output, AIIMS Anesthesia Faculty, Google Scholar, Metrics, India*

1. Introduction

Scholarly communication involves creating, evaluating, sharing, and preserving research to ensure long-term accessibility. Research outputs appear in various formal and informal formats, such as books, journals, conference proceedings, blogs, social media, and pre-print repositories. These platforms are vital in knowledge dissemination, increasing research visibility, and supporting academic institutions. Research visibility is crucial in scholarly communication as it influences recognition, dissemination, and impact. It affects citation rates, collaboration opportunities, and the overall academic influence of research. As Majhi et al. (2025) highlight, researchers and institutions aim to enhance visibility to increase citations and engagement. Technological advancements have led to the development of platforms like Google Scholar, ResearchGate, Academia, Web of Science (WoS), and Scopus, which help track research visibility. These tools analyze metrics such as citation counts, h-index, and i10-index based on an author’s publications. Google Scholar, in particular, allows researchers to create free personal profiles and monitor their academic productivity, offering insights into research impact.

Tracking and improving research visibility is especially important in medicine, where faculty members balance research with professional duties. Medical research contributes significantly

to both academic and practical advancements. Increased citations lead to higher h-index and i10-index scores, further motivating researchers. Numerous studies have assessed the research visibility of academicians and faculty members across various disciplines, particularly in Library and Information Science. However, no research has specifically examined the visibility, productivity, and impact of medical professionals at the All-India Institute of Medical Sciences (AIIMS). This gap may be attributed to several factors. As one of South Asia's leading medical institutions, AIIMS is committed to enhancing faculty expertise, advancing medical systems, and continuously updating treatments. With 42 departments and four centers, the institute has a vast academic landscape.

This study aims to evaluate the research visibility of faculty members in the Department of Anesthesia at AIIMS, where 48 faculty members are currently serving. The analysis utilizes Google Scholar, focusing on key metrics such as total publications, citation counts, h-index, and i10-index to assess their scholarly impact.

2. Review of Literature

Numerous studies have examined various aspects of research visibility, offering valuable insights for scholars. Francke (2022) highlights the dual role of institutional and commercial web profiles in promoting researchers and serving as information sources, noting that profile content shapes perceptions of competence and trustworthiness. Galili and Skov (2023) explore researchers' use of academic web profiles, linking them to motivation, identity, professional goals, institutional guidelines, and technological factors.

Wu et al. (2022) analyze search behaviour on academic social networking sites (ASNSs), focusing on user motives, information needs, and social or research-driven triggers. Bangani and Onyancha (2021) find that most National Research Foundation-rated researchers publish through Google Scholar (GS), followed by Scopus and Web of Science (WoS), with GS receiving the highest number of citations. Similarly, Chapman and Ellinger (2019) highlight disparities in citation counts between GS and commercial academic search engines, complicating research productivity assessments. Dudash and Gordon (2024) suggest that GS

citation counts are useful indicators for identifying key monographs and guiding collection management.

Several studies focus specifically on academic social networking sites (ASNs). Baquee et al. (2024) investigate faculty use of ASNs in Indian central universities, finding widespread adoption, particularly during daytime hours. Munshi et al. (2024) analyze LIS faculty's GS and Scopus citation profiles, reporting 75% presence on GS compared to 58.6% on Scopus. Chen (2023) examines motivators and moderators of sustained information-seeking behaviour in ASNs. Yang et al. (2022) identifies satisfaction, expectations, social identity, and perceived interactivity as key influences on continued ASN use.

Research profiling and citation analysis have also received significant attention. Ali and Richardson (2019) study GS citation metrics for Pakistani LIS scholars, and Wahid et al. (2024) analyze highly productive Pakistani authors, finding that male professors tend to be more prolific. Loan et al. (2022) caution against taking GS h-index values at face value due to inconsistencies in publication and citation counts. Li et al. (2017) explore variations in citation displays across universities, countries, and academic ranks. Ye and Na (2018) compare citation counts with Twitter mentions, highlighting discrepancies in scholarly impact across platforms.

Together, these studies deepen our understanding of research visibility, citation metrics, and the role of Google Scholar and ASNs in academic communication.

3. Objectives of the Study

- To assess the presence of faculty members from the Anesthesia Department at AIIMS, New Delhi, on Google Scholar.
- To analyze their Google Scholar profiles regarding total publications, citation counts, h-index, and i10-index.
- To rank faculty members based on their Google Scholar metrics.

4. Methodology

This study employed an observational method with the help of quantitative analysis, leveraging Google Scholar as a tool to assess research visibility. Faculty member names were sourced from the AIIMS website and meticulously searched on Google Scholar using multiple variations of full names, surnames, first names, designations, and abbreviated forms to ensure precise identification and minimize discrepancies. Data collection took place between February 10 and 20, 2025. The retrieved information, including total publications, citation counts, h-index, and i10-index, was systematically organized in an MS Excel sheet and structured into tables based on the study objectives. Simple statistical percentages were used to analyze the data and extract meaningful insights.

5. Data analysis and interpretation

Google Scholar offers features that allow individual academics to showcase their research productivity and visibility by providing metrics such as total publications, citation counts, h-index, and i10-index. The retrieved data was systematically organized and analyzed under the following subheadings that were aligned with the study objectives.

5.1 Visibility on Google Scholar

Google Scholar enables researchers and academics to create profiles and add scholarly publications, offering a centralized platform to manage their academic output. In recent years, a verified email ID has become a requirement for profile creation on Google Scholar. Table 1 presents the email ID status of faculty members who are present on Google Scholar.

Table 1 presents the profile status of faculty members from the Anesthesia Department at AIIMS, New Delhi, on Google Scholar, specifically focusing on integrating verified email IDs. Among the 27 faculty members, 12 (44.44%) have verified their profiles, while 15 (55.56%) have not. This indicates that more than half of the faculty members have yet to take advantage of this feature, which enhances credibility and academic visibility. When analyzed by designation, additional professors show the highest verification rate, with 80% (4 out of 5)

having integrated their profiles. In contrast, only 33.33% (1 out of 3) of professors and 33.33% (2 out of 6) of associate professors have done so. Assistant professors fall in between, with 38.46% (5 out of 13) verifying their profiles. These findings suggest that mid-career faculty members may be more proactive in managing their research visibility than senior and junior faculty.

In terms of gender, there is no significant difference in verification rates. Among the 16 male faculty members, 7 (43.75%) have verified their profiles, compared to 5 out of 11 (45.45%) female faculty members. The data highlights a general need for increased awareness and participation in profile verification across all faculty levels. Since verified Google Scholar profiles enhance research credibility, facilitate collaboration, and improve citation tracking, encouraging more faculty members, especially senior professors and assistant professors, to complete this process could strengthen the department's overall academic presence and impact.

Table 1: Profile status of Anesthesia Faculty Members on Google Scholar (n=27)

Sl. No.	Faculty's Name	Designation	Gender	Integrated with Verified Email in GS
1	Dr. Jyotsna Punj	Professor	Female	X
2	Dr. Anjolie Chhabra	Professor	Female	√
3	Dr. Rashmi Ramachandran	Professor	Female	X
4	Dr. Puneet Khanna	Additional Professor	Male	X
5	Dr. Bikash Ranjan Ray	Additional Professor	Male	X
6	Dr. Debesh Bhoi	Additional Professor	Male	√
7	Dr. Souvik Maitra	Additional Professor	Male	√
8	Dr. Akhil Kant Singh	Additional Professor	Male	√
9	Dr. Nishant Patel	Additional Professor	Male	√
10	Dr. Abshishek Nagarajappa	Associate Professor	Male	√
11	Dr. Ajisha Aravindan	Associate Professor	Female	X
12	Dr. Sulagna Bhattarcharjee	Associate Professor	Female	√
13	Dr. Anju Gupta	Associate Professor	Female	X
14	Dr. Parin Lalwani	Associate Professor	Female	X
15	Dr. Mritunjay Kumar	Associate Professor	Male	√
16	Dr. Sachin Kumar	Assistant Professor	Male	√
17	Dr. Priyankar Kumar Datta	Assistant Professor	Male	X
18	Dr. Heena Garg	Assistant Professor	Female	X
19	Dr. Sana Yasmin Hussain	Assistant Professor	Female	X
20	Dr. Dhruv Jain	Assistant Professor	Male	X
21	Dr. Nitin Choudhary	Assistant Professor	Male	X
22	Dr. Ram Singh	Assistant Professor	Male	√
23	Dr. Vanitha Rajagopalan (Critical & Intensive Care)	Assistant Professor	Female	√
24	Dr. Amit Kumar Malviya	Assistant Professor	Male	X
25	Dr. Subodh Kumar	Assistant Professor	Male	√
26	Dr. Prakash Gyandev Gondode	Assistant Professor	Male	X
27	Dr. Neha Garg	Assistant Professor	Female	X
				Total: Yes = 12, No=15

5.2 Scholarly Publications

Researchers can publish their scholarly work in various formats, including books, book chapters, journal articles, conference proceedings, etc. Google Scholar is a platform to organize these publications while displaying citation counts and tracking citations over time. Table 2 presents the top 10 faculty members based on the number of scholarly publications.

Sl. No.	Faculty's Name	Designation	Gender	Publications
1	Dr. Anju Gupta	Associate Professor	Female	532
2	Dr. Akhil Kant Singh	Additional Professor	Male	270
3	Dr. Puneet Khanna	Additional Professor	Male	241
4	Dr. Souvik Maitra	Additional Professor	Male	179
5	Dr. Jyotsna Punj	Professor	Female	139
6	Dr. Rashmi Ramachandran	Professor	Female	129
7	Dr. Bikash Ranjan Ray	Additional Professor	Male	113
8	Dr. Anjolie Chhabra	Professor	Female	87
9	Dr. Sulagna Bhattarcharjee	Associate Professor	Female	85
10	Dr. Debesh Bhoi	Additional Professor	Male	80

Table 2: Top Ten Publications Productivity of Faculty Members of Anesthesia Department, AIIMS, New Delhi

Table 2 highlights the top 10 faculty members from the Anesthesia Department at AIIMS, New Delhi, based on the number of scholarly publications. The data reveals significant variation in research productivity among faculty members. Dr. Anju Gupta, an Associate Professor, leads with 532 publications, far surpassing the second-highest contributor, Dr. Akhil Kant Singh, an Additional Professor, with 270 publications. Dr Puneet Khanna follows closely with 241

publications, while Dr Souvik Maitra and Dr Jyotsna Punj have 179 and 139 publications, respectively.

Professors, additional professors, and associate professors dominate the list, indicating that senior and mid-career faculty members contribute substantially to research output. Among the top 10, four are female faculty members, with Dr. Anju Gupta ranking the highest overall. This suggests that male and female faculty members actively engage in research, with female scholars making significant contributions.

The presence of multiple additional professors on the list suggests that faculty at this career stage are particularly productive in research. However, despite holding senior positions, professors appear to have lower publication counts than some additional and associate professors. This could indicate a shift in research priorities at different career stages, with senior faculty focusing more on mentoring and administrative responsibilities.

Overall, the data highlights the diverse research contributions of faculty members, with certain individuals demonstrating exceptionally high productivity. Encouraging broader participation in scholarly publishing and supporting faculty with fewer publications could enhance the department's overall research impact.

5.3 Citation count

A citation count reflects the number of times a publication, such as a journal article, book, or conference paper, is referenced by other researchers in their work. It is a key metric for evaluating the impact and visibility of scholarly contributions, with highly cited publications generally considered more influential. Citation counts may vary across different databases due to variations in indexed content. Since this study is based on Google Scholar, Table 3 presents the top 10 faculty members with the highest citation counts for their research contributions.

Sl. No.	Faculty's Name	Designation	Gender	Top 10 Citation Count
1	Dr. Souvik Maitra	Additional Professor	Male	5969 (179 publications)
2	Dr. Puneet Khanna	Additional Professor	Male	2623 (241 publications)
3	Dr. Anju Gupta	Associate Professor	Female	2251 (532 publications)
4	Dr. Akhil Kant Singh	Additional Professor	Male	1523 (270 publications)
5	Dr. Sulagna Bhattarcharjee	Associate Professor	Female	1335 (85 publications)
6	Dr. Anjolie Chhabra	Professor	Female	1178 (87 publications)
7	Dr. Debesh Bhoi	Additional Professor	Male	1050 (80 publications)
8	Dr. Rashmi Ramachandran	Professor	Female	1042 (129 publications)
9	Dr. Jyotsna Punj	Professor	Female	996 (139 publications)
10	Dr. Bikash Ranjan Ray	Additional Professor	Male	716(113 publications)

Table 3: Top 10 Faculty Members of the Anesthesia Department, AIIMS, based on citation count

Table 3 presents the top 10 faculty members from the Anesthesia Department at AIIMS, New Delhi, based on citation counts. The data reveals notable variations in research impact, as measured by the number of times other researchers have cited their work.

Dr. Souvik Maitra, an Additional Professor, leads with 5,969 citations from 179 publications, demonstrating a high citation-to-publication ratio, which suggests significant research influence.

Dr. Puneet Khanna, also an Additional Professor, followed him with 2,623 citations from 241 publications. Despite having the highest number of publications (532), Dr. Anju Gupta ranks third in total citations (2,251), indicating that citation impact does not always correlate directly with the number of publications.

The data also highlights variations in citation efficiency. For example, Dr. Sulagna Bhattarcharjee, with only 85 publications, has 1,335 citations, showing a strong citation-to-publication ratio. Similarly, Dr. Debesh Bhoi has 1,050 citations from just 80 publications,

reinforcing those certain publications garner more academic attention than others. Conversely, some faculty members with a larger body of work, such as Dr. Akhil Kant Singh (270 publications, 1,523 citations) and Dr. Jyotsna Punj (139 publications, 996 citations), have lower citation counts than their output.

Professors, additional professors, and associate professors dominate the list, reflecting a high level of research engagement at mid-to-senior career levels. Notably, female faculty members comprise 40% of the top 10, with Dr. Anju Gupta leading. This indicates active research contributions from both male and female faculty members.

The citation data highlights the varying impact of scholarly work within the department. While some faculty members produce a large research volume, others achieve high citation counts with fewer publications. Encouraging more impactful research, collaborative projects and strategic publication in high-visibility journals could further enhance the department's academic influence.

5.4 h-index Count

The h-index is a metric that evaluates a researcher’s productivity and impact by determining the number of publications (h) that have received at least h citations. Its value may differ across databases like WoS, Scopus, and Google Scholar due to variations in indexed content. Table 4 highlights the top 10 faculty members from the Anesthesia Department at AIIMS, ranked by their h-index as recorded on Google Scholar.

Table 4 highlights the top 10 faculty members from the Anesthesia Department at AIIMS based on their h-index, which assesses research productivity and citation impact. The data reveals variations in research influence among faculty members, with h-index values ranging from 33 to 15.

Table 4: Top 10 Faculty Members of Anesthesia Department, AIIMS based on h-Index

Sl. No.	**Faculty's Name**	**Designation**	**Gender**	H-Index (%)
1	Dr. Souvik Maitra	Additional Professor	Male	33 (16.26)
2	Dr. Puneet Khanna	Additional Professor	Male	26 (12.81)
3	Dr. Anju Gupta	Associate Professor	Female	24 (11.82)
4	Dr. Sulagna Bhattarcharjee	Associate Professor	Female	20 (9.85)
5	Dr. Akhil Kant Singh	Additional Professor	Male	19 (9.36)
6	Dr. Anjolie Chhabra	Professor	Female	18 (8.87)
7	Dr. Rashmi Ramachandran	Professor	Female	17 (8.37)
8	Dr. Bikash Ranjan Ray	Additional Professor	Male	16 (7.88)
9	Dr. Jyotsna Punj	Professor	Female	15 (7.39)
10	Dr. Debesh Bhoi	Additional Professor	Male	15 (7.39)
			Total	**203(100)**

Dr. Souvik Maitra, an Additional Professor, ranks highest with an h-index of 33, accounting for 16.26% of the total. This indicates that at least 33 of his publications have received 33 or more citations, demonstrating a strong research impact. He is followed by Dr. Puneet Khanna (h-index: 26, 12.81%) and Dr. Anju Gupta (h-index: 24, 11.82%), who also exhibit significant academic influence.

Notably, Associate Professors and Additional Professors dominate the rankings, suggesting that faculty members in these mid-career positions are highly engaged in research. Professors typically have extensive experience and appear lower on the list, possibly due to shifting priorities toward mentorship and administrative roles. Among female faculty members, Dr Anju Gupta leads, followed by Dr Sulagna Bhattarcharjee (h-index: 20, 9.85%) and Dr Anjolie Chhabra (h-index: 18, 8.87%), reflecting their substantial research contributions.

The total h-index sum for these top 10 faculty members is 203, highlighting the department's collective research strength. Encouraging collaborations, publishing in high-impact journals, and engaging in interdisciplinary research could further enhance the h-index values of faculty members, ultimately boosting the department's research visibility and impact.

5.5 i10 Index

The i10-index, introduced by Google Scholar in 2011, quantifies a researcher's impact by counting the number of publications that have received at least 10 citations. This metric provides a straightforward yet effective measure of research productivity and influence. Table 5 presents the top 10 faculty members ranked by their i10-index based on Google Scholar data from this study.

Table 5: Top 10 Faculty Members of the Anesthesia Department, AIIMS, based on the i10 index

Sl. No.	**Faculty's Name**	**Designation**	**Gender**	**i-10 index (%)**
1	Dr. Souvik Maitra	Additional Professor	Male	66 (18.54)
2	Dr. Puneet Khanna	Additional Professor	Male	57 (16.01)
3	Dr. Anju Gupta	Associate Professor	Female	47 (13.20)
4	Dr. Jyotsna Punj	Professor	Female	32 (8.99)
5	Dr. Sulagna Bhattarcharjee	Associate Professor	Female	31 (8.71)
6	Dr. Akhil Kant Singh	Additional Professor	Male	29 (8.15)
7	Dr. Rashmi Ramachandran	Professor	Female	28 (7.87)
8	Dr. Anjolie Chhabra	Professor	Female	25 (7.02)
9	Dr. Bikash Ranjan Ray	Additional Professor	Male	21 (5.89)
10	Dr. Debesh Bhoi	Additional Professor	Male	20 (5.62)
			Total	**356 (100)**

Table 5 presents the top 10 faculty members from the Anesthesia Department at AIIMS based on their i10-index, which measures the number of publications with at least 10 citations. This metric provides insight into the consistency and impact of a researcher's scholarly contributions.

Dr. Souvik Maitra leads the rankings with an i10-index of 66, accounting for 18.54% of the total, indicating a strong research presence with multiple well-cited publications. He is followed by Dr. Puneet Khanna (i10-index: 57, 16.01%) and Dr. Anju Gupta (i10-index: 47, 13.20%), who also exhibit significant research influence. Among female faculty members, Dr Anju Gupta ranks highest, followed by Dr Jyotsna Punj (i10-index: 32, 8.99%) and Dr Sulagna Bhattarcharjee (i10-index: 31, 8.71%), reflecting their substantial contributions to academic literature.

Professors, Associate Professors, and Additional Professors dominate the list, suggesting that faculty members in mid-to-senior career stages have accumulated many well-cited works. The total i10-index for the top 10 faculty members is 356, emphasizing the department's research productivity and visibility. To further enhance their impact, faculty members can focus on publishing in high-impact journals, increasing interdisciplinary collaborations, and actively engaging in academic networking platforms.

6. Discussion

This study emphasizes the importance of research visibility and scholarly impact among faculty members in the Department of Anesthesia at AIIMS, New Delhi. While Google Scholar is a valuable tool for tracking research productivity, findings reveal limited engagement: only 27 out of 48 faculty members have an active profile, with just 12 verifying their email IDs (Table 1). This may be due to the demanding nature of medical practice, where clinical responsibilities take priority. Additionally, many faculty members prefer databases like PubMed for indexing their work and may not fully recognize the significance of research impact metrics such as citation count, h-index, and i10-index on Google Scholar. These findings highlight the need for institutional support and individual efforts to improve research discoverability.

Regarding publication productivity, Associate Professor Dr. Anju Gupta stands out with 532 publications, showcasing significant research contributions (Table 2). However, there is considerable variation in publication output among faculty. Encouraging broader participation in scholarly publishing and supporting faculty with fewer publications could enhance the department's overall research impact.

Beyond publication numbers, citation-based metrics offer a deeper insight into research influence. Additional Professor Dr. Souvik Maitra leads in citation count (5,969), h-index (33), and i10-index (66), indicating that impact is driven by both citation efficiency and academic reach (Tables 3, 4, and 5). Mid-career faculty, particularly Additional and Associate Professors, show higher research engagement compared to senior faculty, who often focus on mentorship, administration, and clinical leadership. Promoting collaborative research and strategic publishing in high-impact journals can further elevate the department's academic presence.

From a gender perspective, female faculty members make notable contributions to research, reinforcing their role in advancing medical scholarship. However, low Google Scholar profile verification rates, particularly among Professors and Assistant Professors, present a challenge to research visibility. Addressing this gap through institutional initiatives that promote profile verification, scholarly publishing, and research dissemination can strengthen the department's academic impact.

7. Conclusion

Research visibility is crucial for academic success, enhancing accessibility, recognition, and citation impact. Google Scholar plays a key role in tracking research output through metrics such as publication count, citation numbers, h-index, and i10-index. This study highlights limited engagement with Google Scholar among faculty members, affecting research visibility. While some faculty have high citation impact despite lower publication numbers, the low verification rate of Google Scholar profiles, particularly among senior and junior faculty, remains a concern.

To enhance research impact, faculty should prioritize publishing in high-impact journals, foster interdisciplinary collaborations, and actively engage with academic networking platforms. Institutional support for profile verification and research dissemination will be essential in strengthening the department's global academic influence. By fostering a culture of scholarly engagement, the Anesthesia Department can further elevate its research standing, facilitating greater recognition, collaboration, and academic excellence on a global scale.

References

Ali, M. Y., & Richardson, J. (2019). Google Scholar Citation metrics of Pakistani LIS scholars: an overview. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, *68*(4/5), 392-412.

Bangani, S., & Onyancha, O. B. (2021). Evaluation of the National Research Foundation-rated researchers' output at a South African university. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, *70*(1/2), 187-202.

Baquee, A., Sevukan, R., & Gul, S. (2024). Use behaviour of academic social networking sites in research communication: a structural equation model. *Online Information Review*, *48*(6), 1159-1176.

Chapman, K., & Ellinger, A. E. (2019). An evaluation of Web of Science, Scopus and Google Scholar citations in operations management. *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, *30*(4), 1039-1053.

Chen, X. (2023). Investigating users' sustained information seeking on academic social networking sites. *Aslib Journal of Information Management*, *75*(6), 1129-1151.

Dudash, A., & Gordon, J. E. (2024). Cited by how many? Using Google Scholar for print monograph collection analysis at a small academic library. *Collection and Curation* (ahead-of-print). DOI 10.1108/CC-02-2023-0012

Francke, H. (2022). Trust in the academy: a conceptual framework for understanding trust on academic web profiles. *Journal of Documentation*, *78*(7), 192-210.

Galili, I. B., & Skov, M. (2023). A conceptual framework for motivation factors influencing researchers' use of academic web profiles. *Journal of Documentation*, *79*(5), 1285-1305.

Li, X., Wu, Q., & Zhang, N. (2017). Citation personal display: A case study of personal websites by physicists in 11 well-known universities. *Journal of Documentation*, *73*(4), 733-747.

Loan, F. A., Nasreen, N., & Bashir, B. (2022). Do authors play fair or manipulate Google Scholar h-index? *Library Hi Tech*, *40*(3), 676-684.

Majhi, S., Sahu, L., & Behera, K. (2023). Practices for enhancing research visibility, citations and impact: review of literature. *Aslib Journal of Information Management*, *75*(6), 1280-1305.

Munshi, S. A., Barsha, S., Pal, A., & Faizan, M. (2024). Exploring online presence: a study of Google Scholar and Scopus for assessing the visibility of LIS faculties in central universities of India. *Information Discovery and Delivery*. DOI 10.1108/IDD-10-2023-0122

Wahid, N., Warraich, N. F., & Tahira, M. (2024). Assessing the research profile of highly productive authors of Pakistan. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, *73*(1/2), 183-201.

Wu, D., Lu, L., & Cheng, L. (2022). Modelling searching on academic social networking sites: a focus on learning outcomes. *The Electronic Library*, *40*(3), 291-310.

Yang, Z., Zhou, Q., Chiu, D. K., & Wang, Y. (2022). Exploring the factors influencing continuous usage intention of academic social network sites. *Online Information Review*, *46*(7), 1225-1241.

Ye, Y. E., & Na, J. C. (2018). To get cited or get tweeted: a study of psychological academic articles. *Online Information Review*, *42*(7), 1065-1081.