

**COMPLEMENTARY MATERIAL TO MANUSCRIPT:
“Methods to estimate the size of Google Scholar”**

Enrique Orduna-Malea*

EC3 Research Group. Instituto de Diseño y Fabricación, Camino de Vera s/n,
Polytechnic University of Valencia (UPV), 46022 Valencia, Spain. E-mail:
enorma@upv.es, Tel: +34 963879480

Juan M. Ayllón

EC3 Research Group. Facultad de Comunicación y Documentación, Universidad de
Granada, 18071, Granada, Spain. E-mail: jayllon@ugr.es

Alberto Martin-Martin

EC3 Research Group. Facultad de Comunicación y Documentación, Universidad de
Granada, 18071, Granada, Spain. E-mail: albertomartin@ugr.es

Emilio Delgado López-Cózar

EC3 Research Group. Facultad de Comunicación y Documentación, Universidad de
Granada, 18071, Granada, Spain. E-mail: edelgado@ugr.es

CONTENTS

Annex I. Catalogue of empirical studies related to the size of Google Scholar.

Annex II. Empirical studies about Google Scholar according to unit of analysis and
document type.

Annex III. Empirical studies about Google Scholar according to indicator measured.

Annex IV. Empirical studies about Google Scholar according to languages.

Annex V. Absurd queries on Google Scholar.

APPENDIX I. CATALOGUE OF EMPIRICAL WORK RELATED TO THE SIZE OF GOOGLE SCHOLAR

AUTHORS	SAMPLE	UNIT	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
KHABSA & GILES (2014)	150 English written documents from MAS; 10 of the most cited documents in each of the 15 fields are randomly sampled.	Citations	86,870		41,778																
KHABSA & GILES (2014)	1,500 documents from MAS; 100 documents belonging to each field, with at least 1 citation.(n=114 million)	Documents (million)	99.3	49	48																
ABDULLAH & THELWALL (2014)	Books (n= 1,357) and citations (n=2,254) of Malaysian books in AHSS disciplines.	Documents	499																		
		Documents (%)	37																		314
		Citations per book	1.67																		23
WINTER & ZADPOOR & DODOU (2014)	Number of citations on to Garfield for WoS and GS	Citations	1,231	607																	
		Unique citations	703	153																	
		(%)	90	48.2																	
HALEY (2014)	50 Top economics finance journals were selected and then scored using both GS and MAS using the PoP software (1993–2012)	Average h-index	154.40	78.98																	
		Average h-index	267.36	125.72																	
		Average AWCRC	9834.00	2740.87																	
		Average e-index	186.21	81.00																	
ORDUÑA-MALEA & DELGADO LÓPEZ-CÓZAR (2014)	World weekly (average) size and monthly growth rate per source	Weekly size (average)	68,545,750	27,904,896	28,113,479																
		Monthly growth rate (%)	11.15	0.37	0.41																
ORTEGA & AGUILLO (2014)	Analysis of the 771 personal profiles appearing in both the MAS and the GSC.	Documents (%)	158.3		89.5																
		Citations (%)	327.4		76.7																
		%	155.8		72.1																
CARDENAS & UDO (2013)	Knowledge management (KM) articles published between 1993 and 2012	KM papers	33,600	9,887																	
		KM papers (%)	77.26	28.59																	
		KM papers in USA	12,434	2,084																	
		KM papers in USA (%)	80.65	14.35																	
ADRIAANSE & RENSLEIGH (2013)	African scholarly environmental sciences journals the period 2004-2008 (n=3,199)	Citations	2,715	2,740		2,192															
		Overall coverage (%)	84.9	85.7		68.5															
		Inconsistencies (%)	448	165		14															
CABEZAS-CLAVIJO & DELGADO LÓPEZ-CÓZAR (2013)	Most relevant journals and researchers in the field of intensive care medicine.	Average Journal H-index	36	28		32															
		Average Author H-index	29	23		25															
DELGADO LÓPEZ-CÓZAR & CABEZAS-CLAVIJO (2013)	N° Journals indexed GSM, JCR and SJR	Journals	40,000								19,708	10,677									
DELGADO LÓPEZ-CÓZAR & REPISO (2013)	Sample of journals from the field of communication studies indexed in three databases.	Number of communication journals covered	277	106		167															
HUH (2013)	Citation indicators of the Korean journal of urology before and after 2010	Citations	428	86		134															
		(%)	44.70	9		14.02														207	101

AUTHORS	SAMPLE	UNIT	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18			
ZARIFMAHMOUDI & KIANIFAR & SADEGHI (2013)	Citations to 2011-2012 articles of Iranian Journal of Basic Medical Sciences (IJBMS) in three resources	Citations	59	20		30																	
		(%)	44.56	29.59		25.85																	
		Unique citations	40	2		6																	
		GS and WoS = 11; GS and SCO = 17; SCO and WoS = 16; GS and SCO and WoS =9																					
AMARA & LANDRY (2012)	Data of scholars of Canadian business schools, used jointly with data extracted from the WoS and GS databases .	Contributions record	21.56	5.08																			
		Citations record	271.53	50.85																			
		Hirsch h-index	4.57	1.87																			
		Proportion of contributions	72.21	27.79																			
		Proportions of citations	69.28	30.72																			
DE GROOTE & RASZEWSKI (2012)	100 articles from the publications of 30 College of Nursing faculty (n=3,000)	Articles	927	795		974																	
		%	34.38	29.49		36.13																	
		H-index	316	215		271																	
		Aggregated h-index	WoS, Scopus, GS, and CINAHL =131; WoS, Scopus and CINAHL=339; WoS and Scopus = 326																				
		Citations	3,492	1,406		2,437																966	
		%	42.10	16.93		29.34																	11.63
		Unique citations	1,312	93		250																	273
%	68.05	4.82		12.97																	14.16		
GIL ROALES-NIETO & O'NEILL (2012)	Articles published in IJP&PT and cited (2001-2010)	Articles	238	238		231																	
		Cited Articles	208	171		167																	
		(%)	87	72		72																	
LASDA BERGMAN (2012)	Top five journals ranked highest in overall quality by the 556 faculty members surveyed (2005)	Citations	3,272	1,741		2,126																	
		Unique citations	1,904	197		339																	
		Overload (%)	44.2	4.6		7.79																	
		GS and WoS = 81 (1.9%); GS and SCO = 324 (7.5%); SCO and WoS = 502 (11.7%); GS, SCO and WoS = 961 (22.3%)																					
MIRI & RAOOFI & HEIDARI (2012)	104 articles of Hepat Mon published in 2009 and 2008 which had been cited in 2010 in three databases including WoS, SCO and GS.	Articles	100	87		91																	
		(%)	91	83.65		87.5																	
		Citations	85	69		86																	
ZARIFMAHMOUDI & SADEGHI (2012)	Citations to 100 articles of Iranian Journal of Nuclear Medicine (IJNM) from 2006-2012 in SCO and GS.	Articles	100			99																	
		Coverage (%)	100			99																	
		Unique citations	18			9																	
		GS and SCO = 44 overlapping citations.																					
KOUSHA & THELWALL & REZAIE (2011)	Comparisons of citation counts for authored books submitted to 7 social sciences and humanities disciplines in the 2008 (n=1,000)	Citations	39,733			12,462															17,905		
		Google Books and Google Scholar citations were 143 and 18% of Scopus citations, respectively.																					

AUTHORS	SAMPLE	UNIT	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
KOUSHA & THELWALL & REZAIE (2011)	Relative overlap and unique citations for GS and Scopus for 100 sampled authored books submitted to the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise	Citations	2,599			789															
		Overlapping GS and SCO= 431																			
		Relative overlap	16.58			54.63															
		Unique citations	2,168			358															
		(%)	83.42			45.37															
BAR-ILAN (2010)	Citations to "Introduction to informetrics" book	Unique citations	109	46		8															
		(%)	27.46	11.59		2.20															
		GS and WoS= 24 (6.05 %); GS and SCO= 21 (5.29%); SCO and WoS=36 (9.7%); GS and SCO and WoS = 153 (38.54%)																			

AUTHORS	SAMPLE	UNIT	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
JACIMOVIĆ & PETROVIĆ & ŽIVKOVIĆ (2010)	Number of cited articles from SDJ	Unique citations	144	4		9															
		(%)	57.84	1.61		3.61															
		GS and WoS= 2 (0.80 %); GS and SCO = 6 (2.41%); SCO and WoS = 37 (14.86%); GS and SCO and WoS = 37 (14.86%)																			
MINGERS & LIPITAKIS (2010)	Publications from 3 UK Business Schools. (n=4,600)	Publications	3,023	1,004																	
		(%)	65.72	21.83																	
ŠEMBER & UTROBIČIĆ & PETRAK (2010)	Croatian medical journal indexed articles (2005- 2006)	Unique citations	86	12		39															
		(%)	22	3		10															
		GS and WoS= 9 (2 %); GS and SCO = 36 (9 %); SCO and WoS = 47 (12%); GS and SCO and WoS = 166 (42%)																			
BORNMANN et al (2009)	Papers published (n=1,837) by the journal AngewandteChemie	Publications	1,747			1,827									1,837	1,837					
		(%)	95.1			99.5										100	100				
		Citations	9,320			44,601										44,502	48,160				
FRANCESCHET (2009)	Publications and cites of computer scientist group	Publications	1,776	324																	
		(%)	84.57	15.43																	
		Citations	10,690	1,378																	
JACOBS (2009)	Comparison of citation counts for 30 Top articles in Gender & Society	Citations	8,047	3,667																	
KULKARNI et al (2009)	Cohort study of 328 articles published	Citations	83,538	68,088		82,076															
MARTELL (2009)	Title search, citations and average citations per article (n=217)	Citations	1,394	680																	
		Average citations per article	6.4	3.1																	
MIKKI (2009)	GS is compared with WoS for earth science authors (n=29)	Publications	5,048	1,573																	
		(%)	76.25	23.76																	
		Citations	40,908	43,028																	
		Average h-index	16.0	16.7																	
MOSKOVKIN (2009)	Publications of the 10 largest universities (2008)	Publications	565,709	55,581																	
		(%)	91.06	8.94																	
ONYANCHA & OCHOLLA & (2009)	Comparison of 10 purposefully selected LIS researchers in South Africa	Publications	384	182		96															
		(%)	58	27.50		14.50															
		Citations	887	125		190															
		Average H-index	5	1.7		2.3															
HARZING & VAN DER WAL (2008)	Comparison between WoS and GS for the impact of books between 1991-2001	Citations	883	346																	
		GS reports 2.5 times as many citations as WoS.																			

AUTHORS	SAMPLE	UNIT	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
KOUSHA & THELWALL (2008)	A sample of 882 articles from 39 open access ISI-indexed journals in 2001	Citations	5,589	4,184																	
		Unique citations	3,202	1,797																	
		ISI citations overlapping with Google Scholar = 2,387																			
BAR-ILAN (2007)	Compares the h-index of highly-cited Israeli researchers	Average H-index	17.55	17.3		17.1															
		Average citations	245.64	162.85		170.27															
MEHO & YANG (2007)	Citations to 25 library and information science (LIS) faculty members (n=5,285)	Distribution of unique and overlapping citations	GS =2,552 (48.3%); SCO AND WoS=1,104 (20.9%); GS, SCO AND WoS=1,629 (30.8%); GS identifies 1,448 (53.0%) more citations than WoS and Scopus together (4,181 citations for GS in comparison to 2,733 for the union of WoS and Scopus)																		
BAKKALBASI et al (2006)	11 journal titles from each discipline (oncology) using the JCR. All articles (n=614) published 1993- 2003	Unique Citations	78	41		74															
		(%)	13	7		12															
		GS AND WoS = 26 (4%); GS AND SCO = 31 (5%); WoS AND SCO = 175 (28%); GS, WoS AND SCO = 189 (31%)																			
BAKKALBASI et al (2006)	11 journal titles (condensed matter physics) using the JCR. All articles(n=296) published 1993-2003	Unique citations	50	63		25															
		(%)	17	20		8															
		GS AND WoS = 21 (9%); GS AND SCO = 9 (3%); WoS AND SCO = 65 (22%); GS, WoS AND SCO = 63 (21%)																			
SALISBURY & TEKA WADE (2006)	Journal coverage for Agricultural Economics and AgriBusiness (2004-2005)	No. of Titles	184										92	133							
		Average year	92											46	66.5						
		% (n=108)	85.19											42.59	61.57						
		Citations (%)	39											17	44						
YANG & MEHO (2006)	Items published by two Library and Information Science full-time faculty members.	Unique citations	38	89		25															
		(%)	9.9	23.1		6.5															
JACSO (2005b)	Citations count for the papers published in 22 volumes of APJAI (n=698)	Documents	680	675																	
		(%)	97.42	96.60																	
		Citations	595	1,355																	
NORUZI (2005)	Citation counts from Google Scholar and Web of Science (WoS) for Almind & Ingwersen	Citations	98	81																	
		Unique citations	64	47																	
		Citations GS AND WoS = 34																			
NORUZI (2005)	Average cites of the most-cited 36 Authors in the field of Webometrics on GS and WoS	Citations	1,110	729																	
		Average citations	30.84	20.25																	

ACRONYMS:

COLUMN	ACRONYM	DATABASE	COLUMN	ACRONYM	DATABASE
1	GS/GSM/GSC	Google Scholar / Google Scholar Metrics/ Google Scholar Citations	10	JCR	Journal Citation Reports
2	WoS	Web of Science	11	ECON	Econlit
3	MAS	Microsoft Academic Search	12	CAB	CAB ABSTRACTS
4	SCO	Scopus	13	SCI	Science Citation Index
5	PUB	Pubmed	14	CA	Chemical Abstracts
6	PSY	PsycINFO	15	GB	Google Books
7	ERIC	Education Resources Information Center	16	KoMCI	Korean Medical Citation Index
8	SSCI	Social Sciences Citation Index	17	KMS	KoreaMed Synapse
9	SJR	SCImago Journal Rank	18	CINAHL	Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature

APPENDIX II. EMPIRICAL STUDIES ABOUT GOOGLE SCHOLAR ACCORDING TO UNIT OF ANALYSIS AND DOCUMENT TYPE

AUTHORS	SAMPLE	TYPE ANALYSIS GS	UNIT	GS/GSM/GSC	%	WoS	%	SCO	%
WINTER, & ZADPOOR & DODOU (2014)	Number of citations on 5th April 2013 to Garfield (1955) for WoS and GS as a function of document type	Citations	Journals	805	69.6	546	90.1		
			Conferences	123	10.6	53	8.7		
			Books or book chapters	63	5.4	7	1.2		
			Theses	75	6.5	0	0		
			Reports	13	1.1	0	0		
			Other	43	3.7	0	0		
			Unknown	34	2.9	0	0		
			Duplicates	64	-	0	0		
			False positives	11	-	1	-		
			All types (incl. duplicates and false positives)	1,231		607			
MIRI & RAOOFI & HEIDARI (2012)	Comparison of Number of Citations in ISI, GS, and SC based on Article Types published in Hepatitis Monthly (2008, 2009)	Citations	Original Article	39		30		40	
			Review Article	28		25		25	
			Brief Report	9		8		10	
			Editorial	8		4		7	
			Case Report	3		3		3	
			Letter to the Editor	-		1		1	
			Guidelines and Clinical Algorithm	-					
LASDA BERGMAN (2012)	Source types of citing references	Citations	Article	1,951	59.6	1,735	99.7	1,782	83.8
			Book	318	9.7			1	0.0
			Conference Paper	32	1.0			25	1.2
			Foreign Language	281	8.6				
			Government Document	44	1.3				
			Dissertation	329	10.1				
			Master's Thesis	108	3.3				
			Bachelor's Thesis	6	0.2				
			Report	84	2.6				
			Syllabus	5	0.2				
			Unpublished Manuscript	44	1.3				
			Working Paper	35	1.1				
			Review	24	0.7			248	11.7
			Presentation Slides	3	0.1				
			Blog	3	0.1				
			Editorial	1	0.0			28	1.3
			Letters to the Editor	1	0.0			10	0.5
			Supplementary Material	1	0.0				
			Web Page	1	0.0				
			Guideline	1	0.0				
			Series			6	0.3		
			Short Survey					5	0.2
Note					27	1.3			
Total			3,272	100.0	1,741	100.0	2,126	100.0	

AUTHORS	SAMPLE	TYPE ANALYSIS GS	UNIT	GS/GSM/GSC	%	WoS	%	SCO	%
MEHO & YANG (2007)	Citations to the work of 25 LIS faculty members Citation count by document type (1996–2005)	Citations	Journal articles	2,215	40.32	1,529	75.6	1,754	76.2
			Conference papers	1,849	33.66	229	11.3	359	15.6
			Review articles	86	1.57	172	8.5	147	6.4
			Editorial materials	25	0.46	63	3.1	36	1.6
			Book reviews	3	0.05	17	0.8	0	0.0
			Letters to the editor	2	0.04	9	0.4	2	0.1
			Biographical item	1	0.02	2	0.1	1	0.0
			Doctoral dissertations	261	4.75				
			Master's theses	243	4.42				
			Book chapters	199	3.62				
			Technical reports	129	2.35				
			Reports	110	2.00				
			Books	102	1.86				
			Conference presentations	72	1.31				
			Unpublished papers	65	1.18				
			Bachelor's theses	34	0.62				
			Working papers	31	0.56				
			Research reports	23	0.42				
			Workshop papers	15	0.27				
			Doctoral dissertation proposals	9	0.16				
			Conference posters	9	0.16				
			Book reviews	3	0.05				
			Master's thesis proposals	3	0.05				
			Preprints	3	0.05				
			Conference paper proposals	2	0.04				
			Government documents	2	0.04				
			Total	5,493	100.00	2,023	100.0	2,301	100.0
			Total from journals	2,332	42.45	1,794	88.7	1,942	84.4
Total from conference papers	1,849	33.66	229	11.3	359	15.6			
Total from journals and conferences	4,181	76.12	2,023	100.0	2,301	100.0			
Total from dissertations/theses	538	9.79							
Total from books	301	5.48							
Total from reports	262	4.77							
Total from other document types	211	3.84							
YANG & MEHO (2006)	Breakdown of citations found in Google Scholar by document type by two library and information science full-time faculty members	Citations	Journal Articles	169	48,4				
			Conference Papers	90	25,8				
			Research reports	39	11,2				
			Dissertations and Theses	15	4,3				
			Dead links	7	2,0				
			Editorial Materials No access	6	1,7				
			Workshops	5	1,4				
			No access	4	1,1				
			Technical reports	3	0,9				
			Websites	3	0,9				
			Other (chapters, bibliographies)	8	2,3				
			Total	349	100				

AUTHORS	SAMPLE	TYPE ANALYSIS GS	UNIT	GS/GSM/GSC	WoS	SCO
JAĆIMOVIĆ & PETROVIĆ & ŽIVKOVIĆ (2010)	SDJ citation was collected in September 2010	Citations	Article	117	50	56
			Review	13	4	6
			Editorial	3	1	3
			Proceedings	3	2	3
			Miscellaneous	8		
BAKKALBASI et al (2006)	11 journal titles from each discipline (1993-2003)	Citations		Oncology	CM Phys	
			Journal	31 (62 %)	18 (37%)	
			Archive	3 (6%)	12 (25%)	
			College or University	9 (18%)	6 (13%)	
			Government	3 (6%)	4 (8%)	
			Non-Governmental Organization	2 (4%)	8 (17 %)	
			Commercial	0	0	
			Other	2 (4%)	0	
			Total	50	48	

AUTHORS	SAMPLE	TYPE ANALYSIS GS	UNIT	GS/GSM/GSC	%	WoS	%	SCO	%	CA	%
BAR-ILAN (2010)	Document types of the unique items retrieved by GS (n=109) were collected in 2008	Documents	Journals	28	25.7%						
			Proceedings	25	22.9%						
			Theses	15	13.8%						
			Book chapters	13	11.9%						
			Reports	10	9.2%						
			Manuscripts	7	6.4%						
			In Chinese	4	3.7%						
			Books	3	2.8%						
			Newsletters	2	1.8%						
			Encyclopedia entries	1	0.9%						
LEVINE-CLARK & KRAUS (2007)	Compare GS and CA for finding Chemistry information in six different searches (n=702)	Documents	Journal Articles (n=564)	482	85.5					521	92.4
			Patents (n=54)	4	7.4					24	100
			Problems (n=26)	26	100					0	0.0
			Conference proceedings (n=23)	11	47.8					12	52.2
			Books (n=21)	21	100					7	33.3
			Dissertations (n=9)	9	100					5	55.6
Others (n= 5)	5	100					2	40			

APPENDIX III. EMPIRICAL STUDIES ABOUT GOOGLE SCHOLAR ACCORDING TO INDICATOR MEASURED

AUTHORS	SAMPLE	TYPE ANALYSIS GS	PUBLICATION TYPES	N	% OF OUTPUTS	PUB GS	PUB WOS	% GS	% WOK	CITATIONS GS	CITATIONS WOS	GS CITATION/ PAPER	WOS CITATION/ PAPER	
MINGERS & LIPITAKIS (2010)	GS and WoS citations by publication type Number of publications from 3 UK Business Schools (n = 4,600)	Citations/ Document	Total books	95	2.1	70				2,257		32.24		
			Total edited books	76	1.7	58				1,763		30.40		
			Total book chapters	619	13.4	287				1,946		6.78		
			Total journal articles	2,109	45.8	1,882	1,004			27,606	8,434	14.67		
			Total conference papers	1,013	22.0	340				848		2.49		
			Total working											
			Total reports	171	3.7	59				491		8.32		
			Total others	110	2.4	41				133		3.24		
			Total	4,600		3,023	1,004			36,579	8,434	12.1		

AUTHORS	SAMPLE	TYPE ANALYSIS GS	PUBLICATION TYPES	GS		WoS		SCOPUS		TOTAL	
				1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
JACIMOVIĆ & PETROVIĆ & ŽIVKOVIĆ (2010)	Type of cited articles from SDJ was collected in September 2010	Citations	Informative articles	23	43	13	14	18	22	32	55
			Original scientific articles	57	86	39	50	38	50	76	119
			Case reports	5	5	2	3	2	3	5	6
			Proceedings	20	31	7	7	5	5	26	37
			Reviews	7	16	4	6	4	6	8	17
			Professional articles	3	6	4	5	5	7	8	12
			Preliminary communications	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
			Articles from praxis	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
			Book reviews	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
			Total	117	189	69	85	73	94	158	249

1: Number of cited; 2: Number of received citations

AUTHORS	SAMPLE	UNIT GS	LANGUAGE	GS/GSM/GSC	%	WoS	%	SCO	%
MEHO & YANG (2007)	Citations to the work of 25 LIS faculty members. Citation count distribution by language (1996 – 2005)	Citations	English	3,891	93.06	2	98.86	2,285	99.30
			Portuguese	92	2.20				
			Spanish	63	1.51	4	0.20	3	0.13
			German	38	0.91	13	0.64	9	0.39
			Chinese	44	1.05				
			French	32	0.77				
			Italian	8	0.19	3	0.15	1	0.04
			Japanese	1	0.02				
			Swedish	3	0.07	3	0.15	3	0.13
			Czech	2	0.05				
			Dutch	2	0.05				
			Finnish	2	0.05				
			Croatian	1	0.02				
			Hungarian	1	0.02				
			Polish	1	0.02				
			Non-English	290	6.94	23	1.14	16	0.70
Total	4,181	100	2,023	100	2,301	100			
NEUHAUS & NEUHAUS & ASHER & WREDE (2006)	Contents of 47 different databases with that of Google Scholar (April-July, 2005)	Documents	English		68				
			Non-English		12				

APPENDIX V. ABSURD QUERIES ON GOOGLE SCHOLAR

Server error with an absurd query on Google Scholar:



The screenshot shows a Google search interface with the query "a -site:ssstfsffsdffasdfs.com" in the search bar. Below the search bar, the text "Server Error" is displayed in bold. Underneath, a message reads: "We're sorry but it appears that there has been an internal server error while processing your request. Our engineers have been notified and are working to resolve the issue. Please try again later."

Absurd query on Google Scholar: excluding patents and citations



The screenshot shows a Google Scholar search interface with the query "1 -site:ssstfsffsdffasdfs.com" in the search bar. Below the search bar, the text "Scholar" is displayed in red. Underneath, the text "About 127,000,000 results (10.99 sec)" is shown.

Absurd query on Google Scholar: excluding patents



The screenshot shows a Google Scholar search interface with the query "1 -site:ssstfsffsdffasdfs.com" in the search bar. Below the search bar, the text "Scholar" is displayed in red. Underneath, the text "About 158,000,000 results (13.66 sec)" is shown.

Absurd query on Google Scholar: including articles, citations and patents



The screenshot shows a Google Scholar search interface with the query "1 -site:ssstfsffsdffasdfs.com" in the search bar. Below the search bar, the text "Scholar" is displayed in red. Underneath, the text "About 170,000,000 results (26.87 sec)" is shown.

Hit count estimates inconsistencies in the activation / deactivation of citations



The screenshot shows a Google Scholar search interface with the query "1 -site:ssstfsffsdffasdfs.com" in the search bar. Below the search bar, the text "Scholar" is displayed in red. Underneath, the text "About 39 results (0.04 sec)" is shown.



The screenshot shows the search results for the query "1 -site:ssstfsffsdffasdfs.com". On the left side, there is a sidebar with filters: "Articles", "Case law", "Federal courts", "California courts", "Select courts...", and "My library". Below these filters, there are options for "Any time", "Since 2014", "Since 2013", "Since 2010", and "Custom range...". The "Custom range..." option is selected, and the date range is set to "1840" — "1840".

The main content area displays two search results:

- Evans v. Gee**
39 US 1, 10 L. Ed. 327 - Supreme Court, 1840 - Google Scholar
Nothing appears in the record showing that Thomas Evans was dead, save an affidavit of one of his sons; and the circumstances that the administrator's name is used in prosecuting the writ of error: but no suggestion of the death of Thomas Evans, nor any revival of the judgment ...
Cited by 49 How cited Related articles All 3 versions Cite Save
- THE UNITED STATES v. GRATIOT ET AL.**
39 US 526, 10 L. Ed. 573 - Supreme Court, 1840 - Google Scholar
... "1. All purchases or other acquisitions of ore, ashes, zinc, or lead, to be from persons authoriz to work the mines, either as lessees, smelters, or diggers, and from no others; and no ore to be purchased from the leased premises of any person without his permission. ...
Cited by 892 How cited Related articles All 3 versions Cite Save

Below the second result, there is another entry:

- Philadelphia & Trenton R. Co. v. Stimpson**
39 US 448, 10 L. Ed. 535 - Supreme Court, 1840 - Google Scholar
... of the plaintiff's right in the alleged invention, but a mere compromise of a pending suit, disconnected with a grant, in writing, made by the plaintiff to the said company; and to that end proposed to put the following questions, respectively, and in order, to the witness: "1. Do you ...
Cited by 555 How cited Related articles All 3 versions Cite Save

Citations deactivated.



Scholar

About 7 results (0.07 sec)

Articles

Case law

Federal courts

California courts

Select courts...

My library

Any time

Since 2014

Since 2013

Since 2010

Custom range...

1840

—

1840

Evans v. Gee

39 US 1, 10 L. Ed. 327 - Supreme Court, 1840 - Google Scholar

Nothing appears in the record showing that Thomas Evans was dead, save an affidavit of one of his sons, and the circumstances that the administrator's name is used in prosecuting the writ of error: but no suggestion of the death of Thomas Evans, nor any revival of the judgment ...

Cited by 49 How cited Related articles All 3 versions Cite Save

THE UNITED STATES v. GRATIOT ET AL.

39 US 526, 10 L. Ed. 573 - Supreme Court, 1840 - Google Scholar

... "1. All purchases or other acquisitions of ore, ashes, zinc, or lead, to be from persons authorized to work the mines, either as lessees, smelters, or diggers, and from no others; and no ore to be purchased from the leased premises of any person without his permission. ...

Cited by 892 How cited Related articles All 3 versions Cite Save

Create alert

[About Google Scholar](#)

[All About Google](#)

[Privacy & Terms](#)

[Give us feedback](#)

Citations activated.

Empty and false SERPs in Google Scholar



Scholar

Page 6 of about 132 results (0.09 sec)

Articles

Create alert

Case law

Federal courts

California courts



Scholar

Page 15 of about 521 results (0.12 sec)

Articles

Create alert

Case law

Federal courts

California courts



Source of all images: Google Scholar

References

- Abdullah, A., & Thelwall, M. (in press). Can the Impact of non-Western Academic Books be Measured? An investigation of Google Books and Google Scholar for Malaysia. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*.
- Adriaanse, L.S., & Rensleigh, C. (2011). Comparing Web of Science, Scopus and Google Scholar from an Environmental Sciences perspective. *South African Journal of Library Information Science*, 77(2), 169–178.
- Amara, N. & Landry, R. (2012). Counting citations in the field of business and management: why use Google Scholar rather than the Web of Science. *Scientometrics*, 93(3), 553–581.
- Bakkalbasi, N., Bauer, K., Glover, J. & Wang, L. (2006). Three options for citation tracking: Google Scholar, Scopus and Web of Science. *Biomedical digital libraries*, 3(1), 7.
- Bar-Ilan, J. (2007). Which h-index? — A comparison of WoS, Scopus and Google Scholar. *Scientometrics*, 74(2), 257–271.
- Bar-Ilan, J. (2010). Citations to the “Introduction to informetrics” indexed by WOS, Scopus and Google Scholar. *Scientometrics*, 82(3), 495–506.
- Bornmann, L., Marx, W., Schier, H., Rahm, E., Thor, A., & Daniel, H. D. (2009). Convergent validity of bibliometric Google Scholar data in the field of chemistry—Citation counts for papers that were accepted by *Angewandte Chemie International Edition* or rejected but published elsewhere, using Google Scholar, Science Citation Index, Sc.. *Journal of Informetrics*, 3(1), 27–35.
- Cabezas-Clavijo, A. & Delgado López-Cózar, E. (2013). Google Scholar and the h-index in biomedicine: the popularization of bibliometric assessment. *Medicina intensiva*, 37(5), 343–354.
- Cardenas, J. & Udo, G.J. (2013). Knowledge Management Literature Trends: an ISI Web of Science and Google Scholar comparison. *Proceedings of the 44th Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute*. Baltimore, November 16-19.
- De Groote, S.L. & Raszewski, R. (2012). Coverage of Google Scholar, Scopus, and Web of Science: A case study of the h-index in nursing. *Nursing Outlook*, 60(6), 391–400.
- Delgado López-Cózar, E. & Repiso, R. (2013). The Impact of Scientific Journals of Communication: Comparing Google Scholar Metrics, Web of Science and Scopus. *Comunicar*, 41, 45-52.
- Franceschet, M. (2009). A comparison of bibliometric indicators for computer science scholars and journals on Web of Science and Google Scholar. *Scientometrics*, 83(1), 243–258.
- Gil Roales-Nieto, J. & O’Neill, B. (2012). A Comparative Study of Journals Quality based on Web of Science, Scopus and Google Scholar: A Case Study with IJP & PT. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 12(3), 453–479.
- Haley, M.R. (2014). Ranking top economics and finance journals using Microsoft Academic Search versus Google Scholar: How does the new publish or perish option compare?. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 65(5), 1079–1084.
- Harzing, A.W. & Van der Wal, R. (2009). A Google Scholar h-index for journals: An alternative metric to measure journal impact in economics and business. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 60(1), 41-46.
- Huh, S. (2013). Citation Analysis of the Korean Journal of Urology From Web of Science, Scopus, Korean Medical Citation Index, KoreaMed Synapse, and Google Scholar. *Korean journal of urology*, 54(4), 220–228.
- Jaćimović, J., Petrović, R., & Živković, S. (2010). A citation analysis of Serbian Dental Journal using Web of Science, Scopus and Google Scholar. *Stomatoloski glasnik Srbije*, 57(4), 201-211.
- Jacobs, J.A. (2009). Where Credit Is Due: Assessing the Visibility of Articles Published in *Gender & Society* with Google Scholar. *Gender & Society*, 23(6), 817–832.
- Jacsó, P. (2005). Comparison and analysis of the citedness scores in Web of Science and Google Scholar. *Digital libraries: Implementing strategies and sharing experiences* (pp. 360-369). Springer Berlin Heidelberg

- Khabsa, M. & Giles, C.L. (2014). The Number of Scholarly Documents on the Public Web. *Plos One*, 9(5), e93949.
- Kousha, K. & Thelwall, M. (2008). Sources of Google Scholar Citations outside the Science Citation Index: A comparison between four science disciplines. *Scientometrics*, 74(2), 273–294.
- Kousha, K., Thelwall, M. & Rezaie, S. (2011). Assessing the citation impact of books: The role of Google Books, Google Scholar, and Scopus. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 62(11), 2147–2164.
- Kulkarni, A.V., Aziz, B., Shams, I., & Busse, J.W. (2009). Comparisons of citations in Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar for articles published in general medical journals. *Jama*, 302(10), 1092-1096.
- Lasda Bergman, E.M. (2012). Finding Citations to Social Work Literature: The Relative Benefits of Using Web of Science, Scopus, or Google Scholar. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 38(6), 370–379.
- Levine-Clark, M. & Kraus, J. (2007). Finding Chemistry Information Using Google Scholar : A Comparison with Chemical Abstracts Service. *Science Technology Libraries*, 27(4), 3–17.
- Martell, C. (2009). A Citation Analysis of College & Research Libraries Comparing Yahoo, Google, Google Scholar, and ISI Web of Knowledge with Implications for Promotion and Tenure. *College Research Libraries*, 70(5), 460–472.
- Meho, L.I. & Yang, K. (2007). Impact of data sources on citation counts and rankings of LIS faculty: Web of Science versus Scopus and Google Scholar. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 58(13), 2105–2125.
- Meier, J.J. & Conkling, T.W. (2008). Google Scholar's Coverage of the Engineering Literature: An Empirical Study. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 34(3), 196–201.
- Mikki, S. (2009). Comparing Google Scholar and ISI Web of Science for Earth Sciences. *Scientometrics*, 82(2), 321–331.
- Mingers, J. & Lipitakis, E.A.E.C.G. (2010). Counting the citations: a comparison of Web of Science and Google Scholar in the field of business and management. *Scientometrics*, 85(2), 613–625.
- Miri, S.M., Raoofi, A. & Heidari, Z. (2012). Citation Analysis of Hepatitis Monthly by Journal Citation Report (ISI), Google Scholar, and Scopus. *Hepatitis Monthly*, 12(9), e7441.
- Moskovkin, V.M. (2009). The potential of using the Google Scholar search engine for estimating the publication activities of universities. *Scientific and Technical Information Processing*, 36(4), 198–202.
- Neuhaus, C., Neuhaus, E., Asher, A., & Wrede, C. (2006). The depth and breadth of Google Scholar: An empirical study. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 6(2), 127-141.
- Noruzi, A. (2005). Google Scholar: The New Generation of Citation Indexes. *Libri*, 55(4), 170-180.
- Onyancha, O.B. & Ocholla, D.N. (2009). Assessing researchers' performance in developing countries: is Google scholar an alternative?. *Mousaion*, 27(1), 43–64.
- Orduña-Malea, E. & Delgado López-Cózar, E. (in press). The dark side of Open Access in Google Scholar: the case of Latin-American repositories. *Scientometrics*.
- Ortega, J.L. & Aguillo, I.F. (2014). Microsoft Academic Search and Google Scholar Citations: Comparative analysis of author profiles. *Journal of the Association for Information Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 65(6), 1149–1156.
- Reina Leal, L.M., Repiso, R. & Delgado López-Cózar, E. (2013). H Index of scientific Nursing journals according to Google Scholar Metrics (2007-2011). *EC3 Reports*, 5.
- Salisbury, L. & Tekawade, A. (2006). Where is agricultural economics and agribusiness research information published and indexed? A comparison of coverage in Web of Knowledge, CAB Abstracts, Econlit, and Google Scholar. *Journal of agricultural & food information*, 7(2-3), 125-143.
- Šember, M., Utrobičić, A. & Petrak, J. (2010). Croatian Medical Journal Citation Score in Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar. *Croatian Medical Journal*, 51(2), 99–103.
- Winter, J.C.F., Zadpoor, A. & Dodou, D. (2014). The expansion of Google Scholar versus Web of Science: a longitudinal study. *Scientometrics*, 98(2), 1547–1565.

- Yang, K. & Meho, L.I. (2006). Citation Analysis: A Comparison of Google Scholar, Scopus, and Web of Science. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 43(1), 1–15.
- Zarifmahmoudi, L., Kianifar, H.R. & Sadeghi, R. (2013). Citation analysis of Iranian Journal of Basic Medical Sciences in ISI web of knowledge, Scopus, and Google Scholar. *Iranian Journal of Basic Medical Sciences*, 16(10), 1027–1030.
- Zarifmahmoudi, L. & Sadeghi, R. (2012). Citation analysis of Iranian journal of nuclear medicine: Comparison of SCOPUS and Google scholar. *Iranian Journal of Nuclear Medicine*, 20(2), 1–7.