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is the Eigenfactor (www.eigenfactor.org), a metric that measures the influence of scholarly journals and is also included in Thomson Scientific’s Journal Citation Report. It is based on an algorithm that evaluates the networks between journals and attempts to “identify the most influential journals, where a journal is considered to be influential if it is cited often by other influential journals.” Two other tools that challenge the JIF, found in the Scopus database, are Source-Normalized Impact per Paper (SNIP) and SCImago Journal and Country Rank (SJR). Using the SNIP and SJR metrics theoretically offers a more normalized approach to selecting journal titles, but both have not been widely marketed to librarians as more effective than the JIF. In April 2012, the latest contenders from Google Scholar emerged: the h5-index and the h5-median. Based on the h-index, which was developed by Jorge E. Hirsch to measure productivity and impact, both are Google Scholar’s attempts to help authors “gauge the visibility and influence of recent articles and scholarly publications.” The top scholarly publications in English, in addition to other languages, can be found on the Google Scholar Metrics Website. What makes this list interesting is its inclusion of open electronic print Websites, such as arXiv.org and RePec, as well as titles published by STM publishers. With the prevalence of social media, this has led to journals and their publishers being able to market and deliver their content faster than the traditional online abstracting and indexing services. Publishers are marketing their authors by producing podcasts discussing their research. The tables of content services are being replaced with Facebook profiles and the sharing of citations at online reference manager websites. Reading has become more intimate, in that you now know what your peers and students are reading by their digital footprint and thumbs up or down. Most sites allow users to comment on a paper and reaffirm the findings or refute the methodology or results. I recently read an article in the Journal of Medical Internet Research about Tweets having the ability to predict citations. The author, Gunther Eysenbach, writes that “twimpact factor may be a useful and timely metric to measure uptake of research findings and to filter research findings resonating with the public in real time.” Social media is changing the dynamics of scholarship in that scientific authors have alternative venues in which to publish their research in progress.

As authors work to craft their final manuscripts for publication, they are using online reference managers to store articles and share data and ideas with one another. Altmetrics, a new contender in the metrics field, is measuring the impact of an author’s paper in the social networking sites.7 This new metric goes beyond the traditional publication-vetting process and captures a paper’s impact in the peer-reviewed crowdsourcing realm.7 It reports the influence of an author’s work or parts of his or her work in the semantic Web. The authors of the Altmetrics: A Manifesto Website believe their measurement will replace the JIF as a better representation of scholarly output. However, Altmetrics has yet to be proven and vetted as reliable. I see it being used alongside other metrics of scholarly validity and finding its place in P&T decisions in determining the effectiveness of scholarly discourse contributed in the social network. Academia has relied on the JIF for several years, and it is a metric that authors, librarians, and publishers understand and know how to use. It will not be disappearing or supplanted anytime soon.
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