# Annals of Library and Information Studies: A Bibliometric study of papers published during 2011-2020

Ajit Kumar
Library and Information Officer,
Nehru Memorial Museum & Library,
Ministry of Culture, Govt. of India,
Teen Murti House, New Delhi-110011
E-Mail: lioajitnmml@gmail.com; lio.nmml@gov.in
*ORCID iD:https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9481-1872*

Ankit Kumar Rana
Nehru Memorial Museum & Library,
Ministry of Culture, Govt. of India,
Teen Murti House, New Delhi-110011
E-Mail:arana9789@gmail.com
*ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5047-316X*

Rahul Kumar Singh
Nehru Memorial Museum & Library,
Ministry of Culture, Govt. of India,
Teen Murti House, New Delhi-110011
E-Mail: rahulnmml@gmail.com; rahulrakia@gmail.com
*ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9878-8868*
*(Corresponding Author)*

**Abstracts**

The study examined bibliometric parameters such as chronological distribution of papers, geographical distribution of papers, distribution of papers by prolific institutions/authors, authorship pattern, and distribution of references, & citations in order to better understand the most recent publication distribution pattern. According to the findings of this study, most of the articles were published in volume 62 in 2015. India contributed a total of 432 articles, with the Union Territory of Delhi topping the list with 142 papers. The maximum number of papers about 150 (58.4%) of the papers were two/double authored. There were 5808 total citations identified among 312 scientific articles, with an average of 18.6 citations per paper.

***Keywords*:** Scientometrics, Bibliometrics, Citation analysis, Annals of Library and Information Studies(ALIS), India

## 0. Introduction

National Institute of Science Communication and Information Resources (NISCAIR), formerly known as Indian National Scientific Documentation (INSDOC), publishes *Annals of Library and Information Studies*, a peer-reviewed quarterly journal. It is regarded as one of the most prestigious publications in the field of library and information science. This journal is also available online, allowing scholars to access the information quickly and easily. The journal's first editor was Dr. S.R. Ranganathan. *Annals of Library Science* was the name of the publication when it first launched in 1957. Due to the journal's breadth, the name was changed to *Annals of Library and Documentation* in 1964, and then name was changed again in 2001 to *Annals of Library and Information Studies*.

During the years 1954 to 1963, Dr. S.R. Ranganathan, the Father of the Indian Library, provided nearly half of the papers.The papers have been abstracted and indexed in *Library and Information Science Abstracts* in the United Kingdom, as well as *Indian Library and Information Science Abstracts* in India.

The term "bibliometric" is combination of the term *"biblio"* and *"metrics"*. The term *"biblio"* is derived from a combination of the *Latin* and *Greek* words *"biblion"*, which means *"book"*. The term *"metrics"* refers to the science of measurement i.e., measurement comes from the *Latin* or *Greek* words *"metricus"* or *"metrikos"*, which both imply *"measuring"* (Singh, and Kumar, 2021).

The current article illustrates the Annals of Library and Information Studies' scholarly communication environment from 2011 to 2020.

## 1. Objectives of the study

With the following objectives, the current study presents a thorough bibliometric analysis of all papers published in *ALIS*from 2011-2020:

- examine the growth of papers published in the *Annals of Library and Information Studies*during 2011-2020;
- examine the geographical distribution of papers in terms of countries and Indian States and the impact of their productivity in terms of average citations per paper (ACPP);
- identify the most prolific institutions & authors and impact of their productivity in terms of average citations per paper;
- identify the sub-disciplines;
- identify the authorship pattern and referencing pattern; and
- examine the citations received by the papers and to identify highly cited authors.

## 2. Review of literature

According to Verma et al. (2007), the majority of papers in Annals of Library and Information Studies are double-authored, with the majority of contributions coming from Delhi. According to Deshmukh (2011), single authorship is more prevalent in book and journal citations, with the ratio of single authorship being higher in books (70.52%) than journals (52.71%).

According to Pandita (2013), an average of 7.04 papers were published in each issue of each volume of Annals of Library and Information Studies between 2002-2012. It is also reported that each article has an average of 17.11 references attributed to it, with co-authorship contributing 65.81% of the articles.

A citation analysis of Annals of Library and Information Studies (ALIS) and DESIDOC Journal of Library and Information Technology (DJLIT) was conducted by Garg and Bebi (2014). According to this research, DJLIT published more articles and earned more citations than ALIS. However, the number of citations per publication in both journals were almost identical.

## 3. Methodology

In order to meet the study's goals, a total 312 research publications were evaluated. The information collected from the papers includes the author's name affiliation, the year and the paper were published, and the number of citations it earned. The citations from July 2021 were analysed using Google Scholar. The data wereanalysed using the complete count technique of output and citations. Unlike first author count, this technique gives each country, state, institution, or author in multi-authored articles unit credit for their efforts. The full count approach overestimates the number of contributions and citations. The real number of papers in this example was 312, which was raised to 595 utilising the full count technique.

## 4. Results and discussion

The findings of the analysis on a few of the parameters specified in the objectives are listed below.

### *5.1 Chronological distribution of papers*

Table 1 shows the researchers' intellectual output from 2011 to 2020. There were 312 articles published in all, according to the data. Volume 62, published in 2015, had the most articles with 38, while volume 66, released in 2019, had the least papers with 20. The greatest total citations were 1307 in 2011, and the lowest total citations were 42 in 2020, according to this data. The greatest ACPP (average citations per paper) in 2011 was 36.3, while the minimum ACPP in 2020 is 1.6.

We also used average citations per article (ACPP) to look at the effect of these prolific institutions' research output, which is explained below. The average number of citations per paper, or ACPP, is a relative metric. It has been frequently employed in bibliometric studies to normalise significant disparities in published output quantities across fields, nations, and

institutions in order to compare research impact meaningfully. ACPP = (Total number of citations for an institution divided by the total number of articles produced by India).

Table 1Distribution of papers from 2011-2020

| Year (Volume) | TP | TP% | TC | TC% | ACPP |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2011 (58) | 36 | 11.5 | 1307 | 22.5 | 36.3 |
| 2012 (59) | 27 | 8.6 | 952 | 16.4 | 35.3 |
| 2013 (60) | 37 | 11.9 | 825 | 14.2 | 22.3 |
| 2014 (61) | 35 | 11.2 | 849 | 14.6 | 24.3 |
| 2015 (62) | 38 | 12.2 | 612 | 10.5 | 16.1 |
| 2016 (63) | 32 | 10.3 | 468 | 8.1 | 14.6 |
| 2017 (64) | 32 | 10.3 | 378 | 6.5 | 11.8 |
| 2018 (65) | 28 | 9.0 | 221 | 3.8 | 7.9 |
| 2019 (66) | 20 | 6.4 | 154 | 2.7 | 7.7 |
| 2020 (67) | 27 | 8.6 | 42 | 0.7 | 1.6 |
| Total | 312 | 100.0 | 5808 | 100.0 | 18.6 |

*Note: TP=total papers; TC=total citations; ACPP=average citations per paper.*

### *5.2 Distribution of papers by country*

There were 312 publications with research papers in them, all of them came from different regions of the world. The output and citations have grown as a result of the comprehensive count technique. Now, this table shows that India provided the most articles (432), followed by Nigeria with 61. Kazakhstan, Tanzania, and Uganda each submitted three papers. India earned the most total citations (4228, 72.28%) while South Africa received the least total citations (10, 0.2 %). Indonesia, on the other hand, did not receive any citations for its contributions to publications.

Table 2 Geographical distribution of papers

| Country | TP | TP (%) | TC | TC (%) | ACPP |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| India | 432 | 72.6 | 4228 | 72.8 | 9.8 |
| Nigeria | 61 | 10.3 | 577 | 9.9 | 9.5 |
| Sri Lanka | 22 | 3.7 | 270 | 4.6 | 12.3 |
| Iran | 20 | 3.4 | 159 | 2.7 | 8.0 |
| Bangladesh | 16 | 2.7 | 211 | 3.6 | 13.2 |
| South Africa | 5 | 0.8 | 10 | 0.2 | 2.0 |
| China | 4 | 0.7 | 24 | 0.4 | 6.0 |
| Indonesia | 4 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| USA | 4 | 0.7 | 18 | 0.3 | 4.5 |
| Kazakhstan | 3 | 0.5 | 33 | 0.6 | 11.0 |
| Tanzania | 3 | 0.5 | 23 | 0.4 | 7.7 |
| Uganda | 3 | 0.5 | 150 | 2.6 | 50.0 |
| Sub total | 577 | 97.0 | 5703 | 98.2 | 9.9 |
| Other 13* countries | 18 | 3.0 | 105 | 1.8 | 5.8 |
| Total | 595 | 100.0 | 5808 | 100.0 | 9.8 |

*Note: TP=total papers; TC=total citations; ACPP=average citations per paper.*
**Canada, Japan, Malaysia, Poland &Brazil two each, and Azerbaijan, Belgium, Botswana, Fiji, Portugal, Russia, Sudan, & United Arab Emirates one each.*

### *5.3 Distribution of papers by Indian States and Union Territories*

Table 3 shows the contributions of 12 Indian states and four Union Territories (UTs) to the journals. The Union Territory of Delhi came out on top, with 142 papers (32.9 percent) contributed, followed by West Bengal and Karnataka. The Union Territory of Delhi (29.5 percent) led the list with 1247 total citations, followed by Kerala (500, 11.8%) and Karnataka (464, 11%). Kerala has the highest average citations per publication (17.9), followed by Madhya Pradesh (15.8), and Maharashtra (15.0).

Table 3
Distribution of papers by Indian States and Union Territories

| State | TP | TP (%) | TC | TC (%) | ACPP |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Delhi | 142 | 32.9 | 1247 | 29.5 | 8.8 |
| West Bengal | 52 | 12.0 | 296 | 7.0 | 5.7 |
| Karnataka | 47 | 10.9 | 464 | 11.0 | 9.9 |
| Kerala | 28 | 6.5 | 500 | 11.8 | 17.9 |
| Maharashtra | 28 | 6.5 | 420 | 9.9 | 15.0 |
| Jammu & Kashmir | 17 | 3.9 | 110 | 2.6 | 6.5 |
| UP | 16 | 3.7 | 152 | 3.6 | 9.5 |
| Tamil Nadu | 13 | 3.0 | 132 | 3.1 | 10.2 |
| Odisha | 11 | 2.5 | 107 | 2.5 | 9.7 |
| Rajasthan | 11 | 2.5 | 58 | 1.4 | 5.3 |
| Chandigarh | 9 | 2.1 | 71 | 1.7 | 7.9 |
| Puducherry | 8 | 1.9 | 27 | 0.6 | 3.4 |
| Gujarat | 7 | 1.6 | 47 | 1.1 | 6.7 |
| Punjab | 6 | 1.4 | 40 | 0.9 | 6.7 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 5 | 1.2 | 51 | 1.2 | 10.2 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 5 | 1.2 | 79 | 1.9 | 15.8 |
| Sub total | 405 | 93.8 | 3801 | 89.9 | 9.4 |
| Other 12 states& UTs | 27 | 6.2 | 427 | 10.1 | 15.8 |
| Total | 432 | (100.0) | 4228 | (100.0) | 9.8 |

*Note: TP=total papers; TC=total citations; ACPP=average citations per paper.*

### *5.4 Distribution of papers by prolific institutions*

The statistics on the distribution of production by prolific institutions is represented in this table. Institutions in various parts of India contributed a total of 595 intellectual contributions. CSIR-NISTADS, Delhi has provided the most articles (33, 5.5%), followed by University of Delhi, Delhi (19, 3.2%), and University of Mysore, Karnataka (14, 2.4%). CSIR-NISTADS, Delhi, received the most total citations with 476 (8.2%), followed by University of Kerala, Kerala, with 215 (3.7%), and IGIDR Mumbai, Maharashtra, with 178 (3.1%). University of Kerala, Kerala had the highest average citations per article of 26.9, followed by IGIDR Mumbai, Maharashtra (25.4), and University of Ibadan, Nigeria (19.6).

Table 4
Distribution of papers by institutions

| Institution | TP | TP (%) | TC | TC (%) | ACPP |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *CSIR-NISTADS, Delhi | 33 | 5.5 | 476 | 8.2 | 14.4 |
| University of Delhi, Delhi | 19 | 3.2 | 101 | 1.7 | 5.3 |
| University of Mysore, Karnataka | 14 | 2.4 | 167 | 2.9 | 11.9 |
| *Bibliometrics Expert Committee, DST, GoI | 13 | 2.2 | 55 | 0.9 | 4.2 |
| University of Dhaka, Bangladesh | 13 | 2.2 | 177 | 3.0 | 13.6 |
| Federal University of Agriculture, Nigeria | 11 | 1.8 | 45 | 0.8 | 4.1 |
| Jawaharlal Nehru University, Delhi | 11 | 1.8 | 74 | 1.3 | 6.7 |
| University of Calcutta, West Bengal | 11 | 1.8 | 31 | 0.5 | 2.8 |
| Indira Gandhi National Open University, Delhi | 10 | 1.7 | 28 | 0.5 | 2.8 |
| University of Colombo, Sri Lanka | 10 | 1.7 | 148 | 2.5 | 14.8 |
| *CSIR-NISCAIR, Delhi | 9 | 1.5 | 97 | 1.7 | 10.8 |
| University of Kashmir, Jammu & Kashmir | 9 | 1.5 | 93 | 1.6 | 10.3 |
| Vidyasagar University, West Bengal | 9 | 1.5 | 18 | 0.3 | 2.0 |
| Banaras Hindu University, UP | 8 | 1.3 | 44 | 0.8 | 5.5 |
| *CSIR-NIIST, Kerala | 8 | 1.3 | 26 | 0.4 | 3.3 |
| *DRDO-DESIDOC, Delhi | 8 | 1.3 | 44 | 0.8 | 5.5 |
| Pondicherry University, Puducherry | 8 | 1.3 | 27 | 0.5 | 3.4 |
| University of Kerala, Kerala | 8 | 1.3 | 215 | 3.7 | 26.9 |
| Visva-Bharati, West Bengal | 8 | 1.3 | 20 | 0.3 | 2.5 |
| *IGIDR Mumbai, Maharashtra | 7 | 1.2 | 178 | 3.1 | 25.4 |
| University of Ibadan, Nigeria | 7 | 1.2 | 137 | 2.4 | 19.6 |
| Covenant University, Nigeria | 6 | 1.0 | 33 | 0.6 | 5.5 |
| Indian Council of Agricultural Research, Delhi | 6 | 1.0 | 81 | 1.4 | 13.5 |
| Vardhman Mahaveer Open University, Rajasthan | 6 | 1.0 | 23 | 0.4 | 3.8 |
| Sub total | 252 | 42.4 | 2338 | 40.3 | 9.3 |
| Other 215 institutions | 343 | 57.6 | 3470 | 59.7 | 10.1 |
| Total | 595 | 100.0 | 5808 | 100.0 | 9.8 |

*Note: TP=total papers; TC=total citations; ACPP=average citations per paper.*
**CSIR: Council of Scientific and Industrial Research; NISTADS: National Institute of Science, Technology and Development Studies; NISCAIR: National Institute of Science Communication and Information Resources; NIIST: National Institute for Interdisciplinary Science and Technology; DST: Department of Science & Technology; GoI: Government of India; Defence Research and Development Organisation; DESIDOC: Defence Scientific Information and Documentation Centre; IGIDR: Indira Gandhi Institute for Development Research.*

### *5.5 Most prolific authors*

Table 6 highlights prolific writers who produced four or more papers in a journal during 2011-2020 based on first author count. B.K. Sen, Biblometrics Expert Committee, DST, GoI (20 papers), K.C. Garg, CSIR-NISTADS, Delhi (11 papers), and next author, also from CSIR-NISDADS, Delhi (8) articles were the initial authors. IGIDR Mumbai, Maharashtra has the highest ACPP value among the prolific authors, followed by University of Mysore, Karnataka.

Table 6
Highly prolific authors

| Author | Institution | TP | TP (%) | TC | TC (%) | ACPP |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sen, B.K. | *Bibliometrics Expert Committee, DST, GoI | 20 | 3.4 | 78 | 1.3 | 3.9 |
| Garg, K.C. | *CSIR-NISTADS, Delhi | 11 | 1.8 | 129 | 2.2 | 11.7 |
| Gupta, B.M. | *CSIR-NISTADS, Delhi | 8 | 1.3 | 138 | 2.4 | 17.3 |
| Dutta, B. | Vidyasagar University, West Bengal | 7 | 1.2 | 17 | 0.3 | 2.4 |
| Ray, P.P. | Visva-Bharati, West Bengal | 7 | 1.2 | 12 | 0.2 | 1.7 |
| Pujar, S.M. | *IGIDR Mumbai, Maharashtra | 6 | 1.0 | 154 | 2.7 | 25.7 |
| Tripathi, H.K. | *ICAR, Delhi | 6 | 1.0 | 81 | 1.4 | 13.5 |
| Das, A.K. | Jawaharlal Nehru University, Delhi | 5 | 0.8 | 15 | 0.3 | 3.0 |
| Dutt, Bharvi | *CSIR-NISTADS, Delhi | 5 | 0.8 | 85 | 1.5 | 17.0 |
| Pal, J.K. | *ISI, West Bengal | 5 | 0.8 | 60 | 1.0 | 12.0 |
| Ram, S. | *JUIT Waknaghat, Himachal Pradesh | 5 | 0.8 | 50 | 0.9 | 10.0 |
| Madhusudhan,M. | University of Delhi, Delhi | 4 | 0.7 | 20 | 0.3 | 5.0 |
| Nikam, K. | University of Mysore, Karnataka | 4 | 0.7 | 75 | 1.3 | 18.8 |
| | Sub total | 93 | 15.6 | 914 | 15.7 | 9.8 |
| | Other authors contributing papers in the range of 1-3 | 502 | 84.4 | 4894 | 84.3 | 9.7 |
| | Total | 595 | 100.0 | 5808 | 100.0 | 9.8 |

*TP=total papers; TC=total citations; ACPP=average citations per paper.*
**DST: Department of Science & Technology; GoI: Government of India; CSIR: Council of Scientific and Industrial Research; NISTADS: National Institute of Science, Technology and Development Studies; IGIDR: Indira Gandhi Institute for Development Research; ICAR: Indian Council of Agricultural Research; ISI:* Indian Statistical Institute;*JUIT: Jaypee University of Information Technology.*

### *5.6Distribution of papers according to sub-disciplines*

Table 6 shows the distribution of production by sub-disciplines. It shows that Bibliometrics (21, 6.7%) published the most articles, followed by Scientometrics (18, 5.8%), and Electronic Resources (13, 4.2%). Together, these three sub disciplines account for roughly 52% of overall production. The remaining 48% was dispersed throughout the various sub-disciplines.

Table 6
Distribution of papers according to sub-disciplines

| Subject | No of papers | % |
|---|---|---|
| Bibliometrics | 21 | 6.7 |
| Scientometrics | 18 | 5.8 |
| Electronic resources | 13 | 4.2 |
| Citation Analysis | 12 | 3.8 |
| Information literacy | 8 | 2.6 |
| LIS Journals | 8 | 2.6 |
| Bradford's Law | 5 | 1.6 |
| Internet | 5 | 1.6 |
| Open Source Software | 5 | 1.6 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Social media | | 5 | 1.6 |
| Colon Classification | | 4 | 1.3 |
| Information and Communications Technology | | 4 | 1.3 |
| Institutional repositories | | 4 | 1.3 |
| Copyright | | 3 | 1.0 |
| Information needs | | 3 | 1.0 |
| Lotka's Law | | 3 | 1.0 |
| Open Access | | 3 | 1.0 |
| | Sub total | 124 | 39.7 |
| | Others | 188 | 60.3 |
| | Total | 312 | 100.0 |

### *5.7 Authorship pattern*

During the period 2011-2020, the total contributions were made by 312 authors. It is indicated that about 151 (48.4%) of the papers were two authored, and 106 (34%) of the paper were single authored. It has been noticed that 43 (43.8%) of papers were three authored and only 12 (3.8%) of papers were more than three authored papers were published during the period of 2011 to 2020. The table also showed that no contribution more than three authored papers in year 2012, 2017, and 2020.

Table7
Authorship pattern

| Year | Single authored papers | Twoauthored papers | Three authored papers | More than threeauthored papers | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2011 | 14 | 14 | 7 | 1 | 36 |
| 2012 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 27 |
| 2013 | 12 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 37 |
| 2014 | 12 | 18 | 3 | 2 | 35 |
| 2015 | 18 | 14 | 4 | 2 | 38 |
| 2016 | 9 | 18 | 3 | 2 | 32 |
| 2017 | 9 | 17 | 6 | 0 | 32 |
| 2018 | 8 | 16 | 2 | 2 | 28 |
| 2019 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 20 |
| 2020 | 6 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 27 |
| | 106 (34.0%) | 151 (48.4%) | 43 (13.8%) | 12 (3.8%) | 312 |

### *5.8Distribution of references*

Any publication would be incomplete without references. These give the reader context for the paper's themes. At the same time, they reassure the reader that the author(s) are well-versed in the history of the subject under investigation and reporting.Table 8 also shows how many

references each volume contains. It shows that the number of references per publication has been steadily rising over time. About 25.2 references were used on average. According to data analysis, the number of references per publication was lower than normal from 2011-2017, but then climbed before decreasing in 2019. However, the year 2020 saw a sharp rise. Volume 65 (2018) has the most references per paper of all the years, with volume 59 (2012) and volume 62 having the fewest (2015).

Table 8
Distribution of references

| Year (Volume) | 2011 (58) | 2012 (59) | 2013 (60) | 2014 (61) | 2015 (62) | 2016 (63) | 2017 (64) | 2018 (65) | 2019 (66) | 2020 (67) | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No. of papers | 36 | 27 | 37 | 35 | 38 | 32 | 32 | 28 | 20 | 27 | 312 |
| No. of references | 828 | 465 | 831 | 803 | 652 | 572 | 616 | 1778 | 460 | 853 | 7858 |
| Average no. of reference per paper | 23.0 | 17.2 | 22.5 | 22.9 | 17.2 | 17.9 | 19.3 | 63.5 | 23.0 | 31.6 | 25.2 |

### *5.9 Distribution of citations*

Eugene Garfield, the founder of the Institute of Scientific Information, invented citation analysis (now Clarivate Analytics, USA). It is scientometrics and bibliometrics' main emphasis area. After the publication of Science Citation Index (now Web of Knowledge), citation analysis received a boost. Citation analysis may be used to investigate the impact of a country's research output on global science. The more a piece is mentioned, the more important it gets. The number of times these articles are cited by other publications is used to determine their citation effect. Citations to a scientific article at high levels are taken as indicators of scientific influence, impact, and visibility. Table 9 shows statistics on the distribution pattern of article citations. Google scholar was used to evaluate the citation data. The citation distribution of papers published in *Annals of Library and Information Studies* from 2011-2020 is shown in Table 9. During this time, 595 publications received a total of 5808 citations. 101 (17%) of the total publications included in the analysis got no citations, while the remainder were referenced one or more times. Of the total cited papers more citation 101 (17%) were cited between 6-10 times, followed by 76 (12.8%) were cited between 11-15 times.

Table 9
Distribution of citations

| No. of citations | TP | TP (%) | TC |
|---|---|---|---|
| Uncited | 101 | 17.0 | 0 |
| 1 | 51 | 8.6 | 51 |
| 2 | 45 | 7.6 | 90 |
| 3 | 27 | 4.5 | 81 |
| 4 | 30 | 5.0 | 120 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 37 | 6.2 | 185 |
| 6-10 | 101 | 17.0 | 783 |
| 11-15 | 76 | 12.8 | 987 |
| 16-20 | 52 | 8.7 | 931 |
| 21-25 | 32 | 5.4 | 734 |
| > 25 | 43 | 7.2 | 1846 |
| Total | 595 | 100.0 | 5808 |

### *5.10 Highly cited papers*

Table 10 shows a list of 12 papers with a high number of citations. Nine articles were written by writers from various Indian states, while three papers were written by authors from Nigeria, Uganda, and Sri Lanka.A total of 603 (10.4%) of all citations were attributed to these 12 papers. The number of citations a document receives varies depending on the time period over which they are computed. The papers of Seena and Pillai were the most cited (67), followed by Pujar and Satyanarayana (60). It is also discovered that Nwagwu and Ajama&Awathy and Gopikuttan articles were identical, totaling 51 citations.

Table 10
Highly cited papers

| Author(s), (institution) and bibliographic details of paper | TC |
|---|---|
| Seena, S.T., & K.G.S. Pillai, (University of Kerala, Kerala), *ALIS, 61*(2), 2014, 132-141. | 67 |
| *Pujar, S.M., & **Satyanarayana, K.V., (*Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, Mumbai, & **Tata Consultancy Services, Hyderabad, Telangana), *ALIS 62*(3), 2015, 186-190. | 60 |
| Nwagwu, W.E., &Ajama, M., (University of Ibadan, Nigeria). *ALIS 58*(3), 2011, 270-281. | 51 |
| *Aswathy, S., & **Gopikuttan, A., (*Indian Space Research Organisation, Govt. of India, Kerala, & **University of Kerala, Kerala), *ALIS, 60*(3), 2013, 176-185. | 51 |
| *Alison, K.A., **Kiyingi, G.W., & ***Baziraake, B.B., (*Makerere University College of Health Sciences, Uganda, **Makerere University College of Computing and Information Sciences, Uganda, & ***Kyambogo University, Uganda), *ALIS 59*(2), 2012, 90-96. | 50 |
| *Chandel, A.S., & **Saikia, M., (*North Eastern Hill University, Shillong, & **Tezpur University, Assam), *ALIS, 59*(3), 2012, 148-154. | 50 |
| *Kumar V, V., & **Jasimudeen, S., (*Mahatma Gandhi University Library, Kerala, & **St. Stephen's College, Kerala), *ALIS 59*(4), 2012, 223-230. | 50 |
| Mittal, R., (CSIR-NISCAIR, Delhi), *ALIS 58*(4), 2011, 319-325. | 49 |
| Pal, J.K., (Indian Statistical Institute, West Bengal). *ALIS, 58*(1), 2011, 7-16. | 47 |
| *Somaratna, S. D., & **Peiris, C.N., (University of Colombo, Sri Lanka & University Grants Commission, Sri Lanka), *ALIS, 58*(2), 2011, 1-18. | 43 |

| | |
|---|---|
| *Pujar, S.M., & **Bansode, S.Y., (*Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, Mumbai, & **University of Pune, Pune), *ALIS, 61*(1), 2014, 74-78. | 43 |
| *Gupta, B.M., **Kaur, H., & *Kshitig, A., (*CSIR-NISTADS, Delhi, & **Government Medical College & Hospital, Chandigarh), *ALIS 59*(4), 2012, 280-288. | 42 |
| Total | 603 |

## 5. Conclusion

The *Annals of Library and Information Studies* has retained its reputation for publishing LIS scholars' research findings. India makes the most contributions, followed by Nigeria. India earned the most overall citations, while South Africa received the fewest total citations. University of Kerala received the most average citations per publication (26.9), followed by IGIDR Mumbai, Maharashtra. The subdiscipline of bibliometrics had the most articles published, followed by scientometrics. The maximum papers were double/two authored. B.K. Sen, who produced a total of 20 publications, is the most productive author, followed by K.C. Garg, who provided 11 works.

## References

Deshmukh, P.P. (2011). Citations in Annals of Library and Information Studies during 1997 to 2010: A study. *Annals of Library and Information Studies, 58*(4), 355-361.

Garg, K.C., &Bebi (2014). A citation study of *Annals of Library and Information Studies (ALIS)* and *DESIDOC Journal of Library and Information Technology (DJLIT). Annals of Library and Information Studies, 61*(3), 212-216.

Garg, K.C.,& Singh, R.K. (2017). Indian Journal of Traditional Knowledge: A bibliometric study. *Library Herald, 55*(4), 488-502.

Pandita, R. (2013). Annals of Library and Information Studies (ALIS) Journal: A Bibliometric Study (2002-2012). *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology, 33*(6), 493-497. https://doi.org/10.14429/djlit.33.6.5481.

Singh, R.K., & Kumar, Ajit (2021). A Bibliometric Study of DESIDOC Journal of Library and Information Technology (2010-2019). *Journal of Indian Library Association, 57*(2), 80-94.

Verma, N., Tamrakar, R., &Sharmab, P. (2007). Analysis of contributions in 'Annals of Library and Information Studies'. *Annals of Library and Information Studies, 54*(2), 106-111.