- [Journal CiteScores 2017-2019](): citation metrics from the Scopus database.
[Reprint pdf]() · [Reprint docx]()

Journal CiteScores 2017-2019: citation metrics from the Scopus database

Will G Hopkins, Institute for Health and Sport, Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia. [Email](). Sportscience 25, i, 2021 (sportsci.org/2021/inbrief.htm#citescores. Reviewer: Andrew Stewart, Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia. Published May 2021. [©2021]()

Updated 6 July. The spreadsheet sorted by cite score had not been properly sorted. It now shows *International Review of Sport and Exercise* as the journal with the highest score, followed closely by *British Journal of Sports Medicine* and *Sports Medicine*.

Updated 28 June. A new [workbook]() shows the latest (2020) and only the previous year's (2019) cite scores, as published by Elsevier in June 2021. Amongst the top journals, *Sports Medicine* has made the biggest jump and is threatening *British Journal of Sports Medicine* for first place. My previous summary workbook showing the scores for 2017, 2018 and 2019 (and the comparison with the impact factors for the top-10 journals in 2019) is still available [here]() and from the links in the item below.

Updated 18 May to include relevant journals with *measurement* or *musc* in the title and a few more relevant clinical journals. Note: *[Frontiers in Sports and Active Living]()* started publishing in 2019, so it is not yet in the Scopus or Web-of-Science databases.

Download a [workbook]() of the current year (2019) and two previous years of CiteScores for journals in sport and exercise medicine and science. Please [email me]() with any journal titles I have missed and I will update the workbook. The rest of this item explains and compares the CiteScore and the traditional impact factor.

After a four-year hiatus, I am again providing a summary of citation scores for the journals in the disciplines of exercise and sport science. As noted in my [2015 article](), I abandoned the traditional impact factor in favor of Elsevier's metric, which is derived from a bibliographic database (Scopus) more relevant to sport and exercise science. The [Scopus site]() allows free access to scores for individual journals and for journals grouped by subject area, but exercise and/or sport science are not included in the available subject areas. I have therefore downloaded the very large and unfriendly workbook (25 MB) of over 40,000 titles from the [Scopus site]() and extracted our journals into a more user-friendly smaller (74 KB) [workbook](), which has spreadsheets sorted by 2019 CiteScore and by journal title. I have included on one of the tabs the SAS program I used to filter for our journals.

The method of calculation of the CiteScore has changed somewhat since [my last article](); specifically, and to quote from the Scopus site, "[the] CiteScore [for a given serial for] 2019 counts the citations received in 2016-2019 to articles, reviews, conference papers, book chapters and data papers published in [the given serial in] 2016-2019, and divides this by the number of publications published in [the serial in] 2016-2019." The traditional impact factor (compiled by Clarivate, formerly Thomson-Reuters and Web of Science) is calculated from the citations in all articles published in 2020 to articles published in a given journal in 2018 and 2019. For formulae that make the definitions clear, see the Wikipedia articles on the [CiteScore]() and [impact factor](). Elsevier's previous metric, the impact per paper, was calculated in the same manner as the impact factor, except that it used the previous three years rather than the previous two; the values were very similar, as detailed in my [2015 article]().

I am unaware of any comparison of the new CiteScore with the impact factor for our journals, so I accessed (via my institution) the impact factors of the top 10 journals in the sport-sciences category at the [Clarivate site]() and added them to the spreadsheet. You will see that Clarivate has omitted many high-scoring journals relevant to our disciplines. You will also see that the CiteScores are higher than the impact factors, on average by 52%, with a range of 21% to 94% (a geometric mean factor of 1.52, with a range 1.21

to 1.94, as shown on the last tab of the spreadsheet). The discrepancies are much greater than those with the original impact-per-paper metric. Is the CiteScore better than the impact factor? Who knows? I suspect that neither is a particularly good measure of a journal's quality, but both are obviously good measures of a journal's popularity with researchers and prestige with bean counters.

———