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Scopus is the largest abstract and citation database of peer-reviewed literature and features smart tools that allow you to track, analyze and visualize scholarly research.

Scopus delivers a comprehensive view on the world of research. No packages, no add-ons. One all-inclusive subscription.
Globally used in research assessment by over 4,000 organizations and 150 funding & assessment bodies which equals over 60% market share
Global Representation means global discovery
Across all subjects and content types

Scopus includes content from more than 5,000 publishers and 105 different countries
• 40 different languages covered
• Updated daily
• Multiple regional content types covered (journals, conferences, books, book series)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Journals by subject area</th>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Conferences</th>
<th>Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences 12,263</td>
<td>23,578 Peer-reviewed journals</td>
<td>111K Conference events</td>
<td>752 Book series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences 13,819</td>
<td>308 Trade journals</td>
<td>8.8M Conference papers Mainly Engineering and Computer Sciences</td>
<td>40K Volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences 10,905</td>
<td>4,065 Active Gold Open Access journals</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6M Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences 6,809</td>
<td>&gt;8,000 Articles in Press</td>
<td></td>
<td>183,034 Stand-alone books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full metadata, abstracts and cited references</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5M Items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Scopus.com, October 2018
Global Representation means global discovery
Across all subjects and content types

- **North America**: 6,000+ titles, 50% more than nearest competitor
- **Middle East & Africa**: 750+ titles, 212% more than nearest competitor
- **Western Europe**: 11,000+ titles, 69% more than nearest competitor
- **East Europe incl. Russia**: 1,400+ titles, 168% more than nearest competitor
- **Latin America**: 700+ titles, 168% more than nearest competitor
- **Asia Pacific**: 2,000+ titles, 230% more than nearest competitor
- **Australia/New Zealand**: 300+ titles, 206% more than nearest competitor
How content is selected for Scopus coverage

Content Selection Advisory Board (CSAB)
Coverage of high quality journals via selection by the independent Content Selection & Advisory Board (CSAB)

The CSAB is an independent board of subject experts from all over the world

- Titles are selected by the independent Content Selection & Advisory Board (CSAB)
- The CSAB is chosen for their expertise in specific subject areas; many have (journal) Editor experience
Transparent Scopus selection criteria for serial content

All titles should meet all minimum criteria in order to be considered for Scopus review:

- Peer-review
- English abstracts
- Regular publication
- Roman script references
- Pub. ethics statement

As a primary publisher and information aggregator, Elsevier understands the needs of Authors, Editors and Publishers and provides resources to support the community. Available resources to help journals with successful title review process:

- [Publication ethics resources](https://www.elsevier.com/solutions/scopus/content/content-policy-and-selection)
- FAQs
- Advisory documents
- Reviewer comments
- Editor and publishing services
- titlesuggestion@scopus.com
Transparent Scopus selection criteria for serial content

Eligible titles are reviewed by the Content Selection & Advisory Board according to a combination of 14 quantitative and qualitative selection criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Policy</th>
<th>Quality of Content</th>
<th>Journal Standing</th>
<th>Regularity</th>
<th>Online Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Convincing editorial concept/policy</td>
<td>• Academic contribution to the field</td>
<td>• Citedness of journal articles in Scopus</td>
<td>• No delay in publication schedule</td>
<td>• Content available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Type of peer-review</td>
<td>• Clarity of abstracts</td>
<td>• Editor standing</td>
<td></td>
<td>• English-language journal home page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diversity geographic distribution of editors</td>
<td>• Quality and conformity with stated aims &amp; scope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Quality of home page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diversity geographic distribution of authors</td>
<td>• Readability of articles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a primary publisher and information aggregator, Elsevier understands the needs of Authors, Editors and Publishers and provides resources to support the community. Available resources to help journals with successful title review process:

publication ethics resources | FAQs | advisory documents | reviewer comments | editor and publishing services

https://www.elsevier.com/solutions/scopus/content/content-policy-and-selection
titlesuggestion@scopus.com
Less than half of the reviewed titles are selected for Scopus coverage

In total 10,443 **titles reviewed** (2011 – 2018 YTD) of which 4,972 (47%) **accepted**

Title review results from top 20 countries with most titles reviewed:
Content creation, quality and accuracy
How does content come into Scopus?

1. Suppliers
   - Translate the content into Elsevier XML format

2. Elsevier’s Processes
   - Elsevier adds additional information, links cited references to indexed documents, and creates author and affiliation profiles

3. Scopus Data
   - The Scopus data is made available through Scopus.com, SciVal.com, and the API

Publishers own the content that is displayed in Scopus
How do we create high quality data?

We extract standardized bibliographic data from full text articles so we can create...

1. counts of papers by year (trends)
2. delineation of scientific fields/subfields
3. counts of papers by researcher
4. counts of papers by institution, province, region and country
5. citations counts, i.e. number of times paper appears in references of other papers to measure scientific impact
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Abstract

Several insect groups have adapted to fire cycles in boreal forests, and can efficiently use new habitats created by fire. Our study aimed at producing a first characterization of post-fire Coleoptera assemblages of black spruce forests of eastern North America. For two years, we sampled Coleoptera using flight-interception traps in burned stands of contrasting age and structure in a 5977-ha wildfire and in neighbouring unburned mature stands. More than 40 species were exclusively captured in burned stands. Time elapsed since fire and proximity of unburned forest were the most significant parameters affecting Coleoptera assemblages. Stand age and structure had limited effects on assemblage structure; the Scolytid Polygraphus rufipes Kirby was the only common species to clearly favor older stands. Fire-associated Coleoptera assemblages found in our study area were clearly distinct from those found in similar unburned stands; we should thus be conservative in our management approach concerning recently burned stands. © 2003 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Boreal forest; Forest fires; Habitat selection; Fire-associated Coleoptera; Salvage logging
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Recent accuracy scores of 13 critical fields

**Accuracy scores of 13 critical fields (relative numbers)**

*Period April 2016 - June 2018*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Apr-16</th>
<th>Nov-17</th>
<th>Jan-18</th>
<th>Jun-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source title</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation type</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page numbers</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article number</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication year</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article title</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author surname</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author initials</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation organization</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation country</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on stratified gold set of 53 thousand records
Continuous improvement: Feedback-driven quality enhancement tools

Author and institutional wizards
Author Feedback Wizard (AFW)

The automatically created Scopus Author Profile showcases various indicators that may be used for various research performance based decisions; therefore, it is important to ensure your profile reflects your information correctly.

In the new version requires login and always offers profile claiming and let users to:

- Set a preferred name
- Merge profiles
- Add and remove documents
- Update affiliation
Institutional Profile Wizard (IPW)

What can an authorized user do with IPW?

Function 1 – Modify Hierarchy
• Review/Update institutional hierarchy; Remove and add child institutions; Place affiliations at the correct level in the organizational structure

Function 2 – Modify Profile
• Check and update preferred name and address details; Add addresses for multiple locations, or in different languages; View, remove and add alternate names

Function 3 – Create Profile
• Request creation of a new profile if one does not exist in Scopus
Upcoming content features
Scopus content roadmap highlights

And beyond:

- 2020: Patents
- 2021: Grey literature
Scopus’ aim is to further grow its content corpus. Previously, title selection was limited to serials with Roman Script References only. Suppliers did not capture non-Roman script references. Goal is to include these references in citation matching.

From July 2018 onwards: Suppliers started indexing & delivering Chinese, Japanese and Russian character cited references.

Next steps after that: Define approach to translate non-Roman script references into English language cited references & send them through M-hub like a regular reference.

Gain is twofold:
1) More cited references present in Scopus leading to more accurate citation counts
2) Removal of ‘Roman Script References mandatory’ as minimum criteria opens the door to many more journals to be evaluated for Scopus indexing.
Problem:
AiPs were a separate Document Type (Doctype). AiPs would only get their final doc type (article, conf. proceeding) once their Final Version was published, thus the AiPs lacked Affiliation info & Cited References.

Solution:

**Solution:**
- Add final DocType (article, conference proceeding) instantly and add AiP as a ‘status’
- **Immediately add Cited References & Affiliation information**
- **Goal:** Get Final Version quality immediately after AiP publication
- **Gain:** Faster identification of final doctype and quicker incorporation of affiliation info and cited refs

Planning:
- Per July 1 suppliers started capturing AiPs according to the above description.
- AiPs as a ‘status’ with Cited Refs & Affiliation info will become visible in Scopus.com per end of this month.
- Sneak preview in Advanced search: DOCTYPE(ip) and REF(1*) – without ‘status’
- ’Status’ to be launched Nov 2018.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Davenport, R.A., Brohi, K.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cause of trauma-induced coagulopathy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://journals.lww.com/co-anesthesiology/pages/default.aspx">http://journals.lww.com/co-anesthesiology/pages/default.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doi: 10.1097/ACO.000000000000295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="#">Full Text</a> View at Publisher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The European guideline on management of major bleeding and coagulopathy following trauma: Fourth edition</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://ccforum.com/content/17">http://ccforum.com/content/17</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="#">Full Text</a> View at Publisher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional affiliations:

- Department of Anaesthesiology
- Department of General Anaesthesiology
- Department of Radiology

View additional affiliations
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View references (28)
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Recent release notes

November 2018
SC Funding – new data structure

• The funding information displayed on the Scopus document details page currently shows each funding grant and sponsor separately. The new funding data structure has consolidated the same funding sponsor into a single funding item line containing all funding grants belonging to the same sponsor.
• With the October 2018 release all future new documents that are to be indexed into Scopus will display the new funding data structure.

• All existing documents before Oct 2018 will keep displaying the current data structure pending re-indexing. After the re-indexing is complete all documents will display the funding information in the new structure.

• Funding (grant) numbers will be comma separated if they belong to the same sponsor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding sponsor</th>
<th>Funding number</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIH Office of the Director</td>
<td>See opportunities by OD</td>
<td>OD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Hi-Bred</td>
<td>DP1-MH100706, R01-DK097768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Hughes Medical Institute</td>
<td>See opportunities by HHMI</td>
<td>HHMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences Research Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>LSRF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institutes of Health</td>
<td>See opportunities by NIH</td>
<td>NIH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institutes of Health</td>
<td>R01-GM34277, R01-CA133404</td>
<td>NIH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damon Runyon Cancer Research Foundation</td>
<td>See opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>PN12EY018244</td>
<td>MIT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SC Funding – improved export format

- As part of the new funding data structure, the Scopus export function (all formats) for Funding details has been updated to improve readability and usability of the data. For example, customers have complained about the .csv export of the funding information. The .csv format for funding has been updated.
• Old funding details field in .csv export has been split up into 3 separate fields.
• If document contains more than one funding text, each text will have their separate fields.
• All changes made to .csv export have been applied to all other export format as well with the exception of the Mendeley and SciVal export.
SC Compare Sources – rebuild layout and interface

- The “Compare Sources” tool has been redesigned to match current rebrand style design of Scopus. Moreover, a number of bugs have been fixed as well. The old ‘tabbed’ design has been removed in favor of a dashboard view with clickable mini-graphs, like the new Analyze search and Analyze author tool.

- The “Compare Sources” tool source selection has been slightly changed to allow users to temporarily disable a specific source in a graph without the need to remove it completely.
• Main search function has been integrated with the left pane containing the search results.
• Changing to a different graph can be done by clicking on the respective mini-graphs below the main graph.
• Zooming in on a line graph can be done by clicking and dragging a section in the graph.
• Table toggle will now only display the data in the main graph.
• Export of .csv has not changed and will contain all the metrics citation and document count available for each source selected.
• Show results based on: Citescore, SJR, SNIP or ISSN has been moved to a separate dropdown next to the sources search results count.
• Fixed bug when arriving on Compare sources page all graph lines have the same color.
Selected sources will be added to a new section named: “Selected sources”.

The selected sources in this section matches with the legend below the main graph.

The selected sources section has 2 options for each displayed source:

a) Selecting and deselecting a checkbox next to a source will enable or disable the display of the source in the graph.

b) Clicking the [x] icon next to a source will completely remove the source from the graph.

The ‘remove all selections’ function will reset and clear out the “selected sources” section.

The legend below the main graph will display 5 sources at a time, use the arrow to navigate between the sources.
Thank you