

Covidization and decovidization of the scientific literature and scientific workforce

John P. A. Ioannidis (1-3), Thomas A. Collins (4), Eran Bendavid (2,5), Jeroen Baas (6)

- (1) Meta-Research Innovation Center at Stanford (METRICS), Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA
- (2) Department of Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA
- (3) Department of Epidemiology and Population Health, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA
- (4) Elsevier, New York, NY, USA
- (5) Department of Health Policy, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA
- (6) Research Intelligence, Elsevier BV, Amsterdam, Netherlands

Correspondence to: John P.A. Ioannidis, MD, DSc, jioannid@stanford.edu

Funding: The work of John Ioannidis is supported by an unrestricted gift from Sue and Bob O'Donnell to Stanford University.

Competing interest statement: METRICS has been funded by grants from the Laura and John Arnold Foundation (Arnold Ventures). TAC and JB are Elsevier employees and Elsevier runs Scopus which is the source of the data.

Contributions: J.P.A.I. wrote the protocol and this was edited by all other authors. J.B. performed analyses and all authors interpreted the data. J.P.A.I. wrote the manuscript and it was edited by all other authors. All authors approved the final manuscript.

Classification: Biological sciences; medical sciences

Keywords: COVID-19; citations; bibliometrics; authorship

Data: All key data are in the manuscript and supplements. Additional more detailed data may be requested from the authors.

Abstract

We examined the growth trajectory and impact of COVID-19-related papers in the scientific literature until August 1, 2024 and how the scientific workforce was engaged in this work. Scopus indexed 718,660 COVID-19-related publications. As proportion of all indexed scientific publications, COVID-19-related publications peaked in September 2021 (4.7%) remained at 4.3-4.6% for another year and then gradually declined, but was still 1.9% in July 2024). COVID-19-related publications included 1,978,612 unique authors: 1,127,215 authors had ≥ 5 full papers in their career and 53,418 authors were in the top-2% of their scientific subfield based on a career-long composite citation indicator. Authors with $>10\%$, $>30\%$ and $>50\%$ of their total career citations be to COVID-19-related publications were 376,942, 201,702, and 125,523, respectively. As of August 1, 2024, 65 of the top-100 most-cited papers published in 2020 were COVID-19-related, declining to 24/100, 19/100, 7/100, and 5/100 for the most-cited papers published in 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024, respectively. Across 174 scientific subfields, 132 had $\geq 10\%$ of their active influential (top-2% by composite citation indicator) authors publish something on COVID-19 during 2020-2024. Among the 300 authors with highest composite citation indicator specifically for their COVID-19-related publications, 41 were editors or journalists/columnists and another 23 had most of their COVID-19 citations to published items other than full papers (opinion pieces/letters/notes). COVID-19 massively engaged the scientific workforce in unprecedented ways. As the pandemic ended, there has been a sharp decline in the overall volume and high impact of newly published COVID-19-related publications.

Significance statement

COVID-19 massively mobilized the scientific workforce. Between 2020 and 2024, over 700,000 papers were published on COVID-19, including 2 million different authors. Across science, almost a third of authors at the top-2% of citation impact in their subfield published on COVID-19. There was a sharp decline in the proportion of COVID-19 papers across science after 2022 and an even more sharp decline in the proportion of COVID-19 papers reaching the highest level of citations. Authors with the highest COVID-19 citation impact prominently included many who were editors, journalists/columnists and opinion writers publishing massively. While other epidemics also witnessed sharp increases and subsequent decline in interest, the magnitude of the covidization and decovidization process is unique in the scientific literature to-date.

INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic was a major crisis that mobilized wide segments of the scientific workforce and led to a large corpus of scientific publications. Earlier analyses suggested that by August 1, 2021, more than 200,000 Scopus-indexed publications were related to COVID-19 (1). More than 700,000 unique authors were involved in these publications with contributions from authors specializing across all 174 subfields of science (according to the Science-Metrix classification) (1). Moreover, in 109 of the 174 subfields, at least 1 in 10 of the most-cited authors (according to a composite citation indicator) (2) had published something on COVID-19. Another analysis, focusing on 2020 and the first part of 2021 (3) found that almost all of the 100 most-cited publications across science in this timeframe were related to COVID-19. COVID-19-related work was on average more cited than work in other fields and this resulted in massive increases in the journal impact factor of some journals and the creation of a new generation of highly-cited scientists (3,4). A new citation elite of authors was created by those who massively boosted their citation metrics with their COVID-19 work (3). The massive growth and wide extent of COVID-19-related publications has led to discussions and concerns about the covidization of the research enterprise (5,6).

Since this earlier work, the pandemic has run its course and ended (7), but some of the repercussions continue to exist and attract scientific interest. The current analysis aims to assess the growth trajectory and impact of COVID-19-related papers in the scientific literature during a period of 4.5 years (from the beginning of 2020 to 1 August 2024) and to examine how the scientific workforce was engaged in this work and potentially disengaged after the crisis had de-escalated. One might hypothesize that both volume and impact may have peaked and declined, perhaps with some time lag with the course of the hard pandemic indicators (e.g. COVID-19-related deaths). However, it is unclear whether the pattern of

decline is qualitatively different to the decline seen for other acute epidemics, such as Zika, H1N1, or Ebola that also attracted sudden scientific attention in the past, albeit at much smaller scale (8-15). Hence, we are using Scopus data until August 2024 to understand better the process of covidization and the potential pace of a respective decovidization of the scientific literature.

METHODS

Protocol

The protocol for this meta-research analysis was registered in advance at Open Science Framework: <https://osf.io/84bdt>.

Search strategy for eligible COVID-19 publications

We used a copy of the Scopus database (16) extracted on 1 August 2024. We followed the exact same search strategy for identifying COVID-19 publications, as in previous work (1), using the query: TITLE-ABS-KEY(sars-cov-2 OR 'coronavirus 2' OR 'corona virus 2' OR covid-19 OR {novel coronavirus} OR {novel corona virus} OR 2019-ncov OR covid OR covid19 OR ncovid-19 OR 'coronavirus disease 2019' OR 'corona virus disease 2019' OR corona-19 OR SARS-nCoV OR ncov-2019) AND PUBYEAR > 2018. As in that previous work, we also further filtered the dataset using the Elsevier International Center for the Study of Research Lab infrastructure to publications indexed (loaded) in Scopus in 2020 or later, and with the publication year of 2020 or greater. We evaluated publication dates by month, where month was available. When publication month was either unavailable or exceeded the indexing date, we used the indexing date instead. This accounts for cases where an article is published early, but the official journal issue appears later. We were interested in the date at which publications became available to the public rather than official publication dates.

Also similar to previous work (1), we considered both publications in peer-reviewed venues and preprints. To avoid double counting of the same item published both in a peer-reviewed journal and as a preprint, or/and in two preprint servers, we identified and filtered out duplicates by matching against author names and titles. We applied methods used for unstructured reference linking (17) ranking documents based on similarity of fields. The best match is based on the overlap between words in the title and author names. We excluded preprints that link to either a non-preprint item, such as journal articles, or an earlier preprint. The result of this step is the exclusion of 38,641 preprints.

We further focused on the 6,653,434 “active” authors who have at least one Scopus-indexed publication since 2020 and who have also authored in their entire career at least five Scopus-indexed papers classified as articles, reviews or conference papers (“full articles”). This excludes authors with limited recent presence in the scientific literature and some author IDs that may represent split fragments of the publication record of more prolific authors.

Field classification

All authors were assigned to their most common field and subfield discipline of their career by field breakdown of their publications. Similar to previous work (1), we used the Science Metrix classification of science, which is a standard mapping of all science into 21 main fields and 174 subfield disciplines (18).

Influential scientists

We also examined how COVID-19 has affected the publication portfolio of researchers whose work has the largest citation impact in the literature. We used the career-long citation statistics calculated with the Scopus database of 1 August 2024 (19). Each author has been assigned to the main field and main subfield based on the largest proportion of publications across fields, and analysis is restricted to the top 2% authors per Science Metrix subfield. We have previously developed a composite citation indicator (2,20,21) that

combines information on six indices: total citations, Hirsch h-index, Schreiber hm-index, citations to single-authored papers, citations to first- or single-authored papers, and citations to first-, single- or last-authored papers. Self-citations are excluded from all calculations. Accordingly 212,343 scientists can be classified as being in the top 2% of their main subfield discipline based on the citations that their work received through the end of 2023. Of those, 174,764 were active and had published at least one paper also in 2020-2024.

Authors with high citation impact of their COVID-19 publication record

We also identified the 300 authors whose COVID-19 publications to date had the highest citation impact. The same composite citation indicator for all authors was calculated limited to COVID-19-related publications and the top-300 highest scoring authors were selected.

Analyses

The following descriptive analyses were done on the data generated as stated above. First, we obtained the total number of COVID-19-related publications and the total number of authors involved (overall; among those who published at least one item in 2020-2024 and had at least 5 full papers in their career; and among those in the top-2% of impact who also published at least one item in 2020-2024). We also noted how many authors in these three authors' sets had >10%, >30% and >50% of their total career-long citations be to COVID-19-related publications.

Second, we evaluated the monthly publication of COVID-19-related items from January 2020 until mid-2024 to identify if there was a peak and if so, how rapid and extensive the decline had been afterwards. We used both absolute counts of published items as well as proportions of total Scopus items. Proportionate analysis is more reliable to assess changes over time, since the number of total published items indexed each month is increasing over time and indexing may have some time lag thus absolute counts may be

lower in very recent months. The curve of monthly COVID-19-related items was also juxtaposed against the bursts of bibliographic coverage of other epidemics that attracted sudden attention in the past. For these analyses, published items were found in Scopus using the search terms “Zika”, “H1N1”, and “Ebola” with the period of interest starting in 2016, 2009, and 2014, respectively. Given the older time frames where monthly data may not be accurate, we used annual data for the other epidemics. Furthermore, in exploratory analyses we assessed the citation of COVID-19-related papers overall and per month versus other papers published in 2020-2024.

Third, we evaluated how many of the top-100 most-cited papers published in 2020 were on COVID-19, and how this declined for the 100 most-cited papers published in 2021, 2022, 2023, and the first part of 2024. For generating the lists of the top-cited papers, we used citations received as of 1 August 2024. In order to see if the most-cited COVID-19 highly-cited papers were gradually falling off the top-cited list of the most-cited items across all science, we compared these numbers against figures on the top-100 of each year based on citations received until the end of 2020, end of 2021, end of 2022, and end of 2023.

Fourth, we evaluated for each of the 174 scientific subfields what was the proportion of active (those with at least one published item in 2020-2024) top-2% influential scientists who had published something on COVID-19 in 2020, in 2021, in 2022, in 2023, and in the first part of 2024. We then noted how many subfields in each year had at least 5%, 10%, 30%, and 50% of their active top-2% influential scientists publishing anything on COVID-19. We hypothesized that after an initial mobilization of expertise across many diverse fields, over time only specific fields would continue to have many top-cited scientists publishing on COVID-19.

Fifth, for each of the 300 authors with the highest composite citation indicator for their COVID-19 publications, we recorded how many citations their COVID-19-related work

had received in 2020, in 2021, in 2022, in 2023, and in first part of 2024. We then examined whether the median proportion of citations received decreased over time. We also examined to what extent the list of the 300 top-cited authors for COVID-19 related work by 1 August 2024 overlapped with the list of the 300 top-cited authors for COVID-19-related work by 1 August 2021 generated in our previous analysis (1). This allowed to examine if the COVID-19 citation elite was largely determined in the early phases of the pandemic. Upon collating the list of the 300 top-cited authors, we observed that many, especially those at the very top of the list, were editors or journalists/columnists rather than scientists contributing original work. Therefore, we also assessed how many of the 300 were editors or journalists/columnists with most of all COVID-19 citation impact related to that role; and how many were other scientists who had >50% of their citations to COVID-19-related publications given to items that were not full papers (“articles”, “reviews” or “conference papers” in the Scopus classification of published items), i.e. largely to opinion pieces, letters and shorter notes.

RESULTS

COVID-19 published items and authors

As of 1 August 2024, Scopus classified 718,660 published items as relevant to COVID-19. This number accounts for 3.6% of the 19,971,245 published items across all science in the period 1 January 2020 until 1 August 2024. The COVID-19-related published items were classified by Scopus as articles (453,331, 63.1%), reviews (59,920, 8.3%), letters (43,781, 6.1%), conference papers (42,354, 5.9%), non-matched preprints (33,166, 4.6%), notes (25,423, 3.5%), editorials (23,486, 3.3%) and other items (37,199, 5.2%).

The 718,660 COVID-19-related items include 1,978,612 unique authors (with different Scopus IDs), amounting to 9.7% of the 20,365,211 author IDs who have published at least 1 paper of any type and on any topic in 2020-first part of 2024. Among the 6,653,434

authors who have published anything that is Scopus-indexed in 2020-first part of 2024 and who have also authored in their entire career at least five Scopus-indexed full papers (classified as articles, reviews or conference papers), 1,127,215 of these authors (16.9%) had at least one published and indexed COVID-19-related item. When further limited to the top-2% in citation impact, there were 53,418 authors out of 174,764 (30.6%) with at least one published and indexed COVID-19 item.

A total of 921,211 authors (376,886 with at least 5 full papers, 2,471 among the top-2%) had >10% of their total career-long citations be to COVID-19-related work. This represented 4.5%, 5.7%, and 1.4%, of the total authors across science in these categories, respectively. The respective number of authors with >30% of their total career-long citations be to COVID-19-related work was 703,319 (201,707 with at least 5 full papers, 602 among the top-2%). With a >50% citation threshold, the number of authors was 584,397 (125,665 with at least 5 full papers, 210 among the top-2%).

Monthly COVID-19-related publications

Figure 1 shows the monthly COVID-19-related publications in absolute numbers (Figure 1A) and as percentage of total published publications across all science (Figure 1B). As shown, the peak percentage was reached in September 2021 with 4.7% of all items published that month and the percentage remained very high, at 4.3-4.6%, for another year. This period corresponds also to last peak of COVID-19-related deaths globally (February 2022). There was steady decline afterwards, but even in July 2024 COVID-19-related papers still accounted for 1.9% of all published items across science. This represented a 60% decline from the peak value. Conversely, COVID-19 deaths recorded globally had declined by more than 95% of the last peak (February 2022) by summer 2023 and remained as low or lower after this.

In the cases of Zika, H1N1, and Ebola, there was also a prompt steeper decline after the peak (Figure 1C). Of interest, with the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, these other epidemic infections also showed a renewal of interest with an increase of their relative percentage during 2020. The increase was entirely due to papers that were also COVID-19-related (Figure 1D).

The COVID-19-related items have received 10,453,962 citations in total. As shown in Figure 2A, monthly citations have remained very high even in the first part of 2024, but they do not seem to increase further and they are distributed to an increasing volume of total COVID-19-related papers. Among all papers across science published in 2020 forward, COVID-19-related papers reached a peak 37% of total citations by April 2020, but had steeply declined to 3% by mid-2024 (Figure 2B). As shown in Figure 3, COVID-19-related papers were far more cited than other papers in 2020 and in 2021 and this resulted even in a shift of the citation distribution across all science (Figure 3A and B). This shift pattern was no longer discernible in 2022 and 2023 (Figure 3C and D).

COVID-19-related items among the top-100 most-cited across science

As shown in Table 1, by mid-2024, COVID-19-related items accounted for the large majority of the top-100 most-cited items across science published in 2020, but the proportion sharply declined afterwards and for the first part of 2024 only 5 of the top-100 most-cited items were related to COVID-19. The proportion of COVID-19-related items among the top-100 most-cited items across science was the highest in 2020 and 2021 and then sharply declined in subsequent years.

Involvement of 2% top-cited scientists in COVID-19-related publications across scientific subfields

As shown in Table 2, in every calendar year the large majority of the 174 subfields of science had at least 5% of their top-2% most-cited authors published something on COVID-

19 and the majority of fields had even >10% of their top-cited authors publish on COVID-19. In a modest minority of subfields, every year >50% of the top-cited authors published on COVID-19, but this was limited by 2023 to only Emergency and Critical Medicine, Virology, Public Health, and Geriatrics (2024 calendar year data are not yet complete). When considering the entire 2020-first part of 2024 period, almost all scientific subfields (157/174, 90%) had at least 5% of their top-cited authors publish on COVID-19, and 17 scientific subfields (10%) had more than half of their top-cited authors publish on COVID-19.

Authors with highest citation impact for COVID-19 publications

Supplementary Table S1 shows the 300 authors with the highest impact on their COVID-19-related publications based on a composite citation indicator limited to their COVID-19-related items and excluding self-citations. Among these 300 authors, the median proportion of the citations received to their COVID-19 work was 35% in 2020, 59% in 2021, 62% in 2022, 54% in 2023, and 45% in the first half of 2024 suggesting that for most of them in each calendar year COVID-19 was their main source of citation impact with only modest decline after a peak in 2022. 41 of these 300 authors were editors of journalists/columnists in major journals and another 23 had received >50% of their citations to COVID-10-related publications to items that were not full papers (articles/reviews/conference papers), but typically opinion pieces (editorials and commentaries), letters/correspondence, or short notes, most of them published very early in the pandemic. Table 3 shows the 40 non-editor/journalist/columnist authors with highest composite citation indicators of COVID-19-related work, revealing a large diversity of main subfields of work and a scatter across very diverse countries and institutions. 33/40 had received >30% of their total citations in 2020-first part of 2024 for COVID-19-related publications. Of the 300 most-cited authors for their COVID-19-related work as of 1 August 2021, 186 had remained on the top-300 list when data to 1 August 2024 were considered.

DISCUSSION

This meta-research analysis shows that over 700,000 COVID-19-related published papers were indexed in Scopus in 2020-first part of 2024 and this work involved 2 million different authors. This amounted to approximately 4% of the scientific literature indexed in Scopus and approximately 10% of the publishing scientific workforce. The proportion of authors who were involved in some COVID-19 publications was even higher among scientists with a track record of at least 5 published items (17%) and even more so among the top-2% most cited scientists (31%), presumably because when authors are more prolific they are more likely to have been involved in at least one COVID-19-related paper among many others. Nevertheless, COVID-19 also created a new large scientific workforce that has been highly committed to it: for more than half a million authors, more than half of their citations to-date are to COVID-19-related items. COVID-19-related papers practically monopolized the top-ranks of the most-cited publications across all science during 2020 and 2021. Since then, there has been a sharp decline in the number of extremely highly cited COVID-19 papers. There has been also a sharp decline in the continuing volume of COVID-19 publications after the fall of 2022. This is consistent with other prior epidemics where publication volume quickly declined after their acute phase. However, even by mid-2024 very large numbers of COVID-19 papers continue to be published, accounting for 1.9% of all scientific papers, while at the same time COVID-19 deaths currently represent approximately a log₁₀ scale lower proportion of all global deaths. COVID-19-related papers have already received more than 10 million citations, but the rate of new citations has stabilized and it is spread more thinly across a much larger volume of existing COVID-19-related papers. In the large majority of the 174 subfields of science, there was still a sizeable number of top-cited authors who have continued to published COVID-19-related work even during 2023 and the first part of 2024. However, only 4 subfields have most of their top-cited authors continue to

publish on COVID-19 by 2023. The top-cited authors within the COVID-19 literature cover a diverse range of disciplines and most of them yield the majority of their citations through COVID-19-related work.

The overall picture suggests a massive covidization and rapid decovidization of the scientific literature. The magnitude of these processes is unprecedented: the monthly volume of COVID-19 published papers at the covidization peak exceeded the volume of papers published by entire classic large disciplines such as Neuroscience, Ecology, Psychology, or Agriculture and it was more than an order of magnitude larger than the literature in fields like Mathematics (21). Even with ~60% decline since then, the number of monthly papers has remained very large in absolute numbers even in mid-2024. Some papers may represent work that was done a while ago and took time to get published. Looking forward, funding and incentives may regulate interest in future COVID-19 publications. Some journal editors in pursuit of boosting their impact factors may still have a perception that COVID-19 papers are more cited than other papers (4,22,23), although the advantage seems to have decreased or even disappeared currently. Teams that shifted their interest to COVID-19 may not find it easy to disengage and move back to their previous research agendas. Moreover, a large new scientific workforce has been created, counting more than half a million authors whose track record to-date is mostly on COVID-19. Even in the absence of a new resurgence of a coronavirus pandemic, large numbers of COVID-19-related publications may continue to be released for the foreseeable future. The lesser citation impact that they enjoy may nevertheless gradually create an increasing disincentive. Further follow-up of the trajectory of the COVID-19 corpus will be interesting to pursue to understand better its complex dynamics.

The involvement of scientists in COVID-19 research was previously shown (1) to cover all 174 subfields of science already by the end of 2020. Wide involvement of very

diverse fields has continued until mid-2024. Interdisciplinarity is desirable. Conversely, the occupation of experts with research that is remote from their main expertise may be problematic. There is a large number of studies suggesting that much COVID-19-related research has been of low quality (24-30). It is unknown whether a more voluminous literature may be associated with better quality currently and in the future. By 2023, only very few scientific subfields (all of them highly relevant to COVID-19) had the majority of their top-cited authors involved in COVID-19-related publications. This may herald some more focused, relevant expertise involved in currently published work.

Finally, COVID-19 not only generated a large new workforce committed to its study, but also generated a new citation elite (3). Our current analysis show that the highest citation impact scientists are usually highly focused on COVID-19 work, and this has continued for 4.5 years already with relatively little change overall. There is also a minority of influential COVID-19 researchers, nevertheless, who are also heavily cited in other scientific areas as well. A large number of the most influential authors on COVID-19 have been editors or journalists and columnists, mostly in high impact journals such as Nature, Science, BMJ, Lancet, and JAMA. Many others have obtained most of their citations to COVID-19 work through opinion pieces and letters/correspondence items rather than full articles. Many of these pieces were published very early in the pandemic and even though they were opinions or had limited data they attracted tremendous citations as they were available to be cited by the large volume of papers that followed. It has been observed across diverse scientific fields that early papers that achieve highly-cited status become ossified as references and new work, even if better, may not replace them (31). Moreover, the composite citation indicator that we used gives substantial weight to single- or first-authored publications. This may partly explain why several editorialists and columnists rank so highly. However, this alone would not suffice to rank them in the top positions of impact. The main reason is that many of these

people authored extreme numbers of editorial or journalistic articles, some of which attracted substantial citations given the venues where they were published (32). Previous work on these extremely publishing non-research authors has questioned whether having non-experts with such a heavy presence and influence in the most visible literature is desirable (32). There is also evidence for advocacy bias affecting the COVID-19 literature where advocate authors with specific, biased viewpoints were given priority to spread massively their opinions (33,34).

Some limitations of our work should be discussed. First, our search strategy may have missed some relevant papers and may have had imperfect specificity. However, the voluminous nature of the COVID-19 literature is unquestionable. If anything, many journals are not indexed in Scopus, so the number of COVID-19 papers and authors may be an underestimate. Furthermore, our search focused on title-abstract-keywords, which miss many papers that may have secondary but still substantive mentions of COVID-19 material. Second, recall and precision for author IDs in Scopus is very high (19), but some authors may have been split in more than one ID profile, and some papers of different authors may cluster in the same ID profile. Some author ID profiles with 1 or a few papers are difficult to prove whether they are indeed different authors or simply fragments from the track record of a more prolific other author. The data on authors with at least 5 papers may thus be more reliable.

Acknowledging these caveats, our analysis demonstrates massive covidization and rapid ongoing decovidization of the scientific literature. While the COVID-19 field still has several important questions to address, including long-term outcomes and consequences of the pandemic and the pandemic response measures and interventions, a more targeted evolution of this literature and rational, focused efforts rather than diffuse over-productivity may be preferable.

Table 1. Percentage of COVID-19-related items among the top-100 most-cited items across all science

Number of COVID-19 items among top-100 most-cited

Citation analysis across all science performed at

Year of publication	End-2020	End-2021	End-2022	End-2023	2024 (first part)
2020	92	92	84	69	65
2021	N/A	57	47	30	24
2022	N/A	N/A	47	29	19
2023	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	7
2024 (first part)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5

N/A: not applicable

Table 2. Scientific subfields (among a total of 174) that had at least 5%, 10%, 30% or 50% of their 2% top-cited authors (based on composite citation indicator, whole career impact to end-2023) publish at least one COVID-19-related item in each calendar year and overall in 2020-2024 (until 1 August 2024)

Year	Subfields with representation among 2% top-cited authors			
	>=5%	>=10%	>=30%	>=50%
2020	120	93	22	2
2021	138	107	38	12
2022	134	109	40	9
2023	129	100	35	4
2024 (first part)	109	81	15	2
2020 to first part of 2024	157	132	71	17

Table 3. Top-40 authors with highest composite citation indicator for COVID-19-related published items during 2020-First Part of 2024. Editors and journalists/columnists are excluded.

AUTHOR	AFFILIATION		MAIN SUBFIELD	SECOND SUBFIELD
Krammer, Florian	Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai	usa	Virology	Immunology
Ivanov, Dmitry	Hochschule für Wirtschaft und Recht Berlin	deu	Operations Research	Industrial Engineering & Automation
Henry, Brandon M.	Cincinnati Children's Hospital MC	usa	General Clinical Medicine	General & Internal Medicine
Lu, Hongzhou	Second Affiliated Hospital of Southern Univ of Science and Technology	chn	Microbiology	Oncology & Carcinogenesis
Lippi, Giuseppe	Università degli Studi di Verona	ita	General Clinical Medicine	Cardiovascular System & Hem
Ioannidis, John P.A.*	Stanford Univ	usa	General & Internal Medicine	Epidemiology
Greenhalgh, Trisha*	Univ of Oxford Medical Sciences Division	gbr	General & Internal Medicine	Public Health
Thachil, Jecko	Univ of Manchester	gbr	Cardiovascular System & Hem	Immunology
Wilder-Smith, Annelies	Organisation Mondiale de la Santé	che	Tropical Medicine	Microbiology
Iwasaki, Akiko	Yale School of Medicine	usa	Immunology	Developmental Biology
Perlman, Stanley	Univ of Iowa Carver College of Medicine	usa	Virology	Immunology
Jiang, Shibo	Fudan University	chn	Virology	Microbiology
Taylor, Steven	Univ of British Columbia	can	Clinical Psychology	Psychiatry
Banerjee, Debanjan	Apollo Multispecialty Hospitals	ind	Psychiatry	General & Internal Medicine
Rajkumar, Ravi Philip	Jawaharlal Institute of Postgraduate Medical Education and Research	ind	Psychiatry	Public Health
Graham, Barney S.	NIH	usa	Immunology	Virology
Ludvigsson, Jonas F.*	Karolinska Institutet	swe	Gastroenterology & Hepatology	General & Internal Medicine
Lin, Chung Ying	National Cheng Kung University	twn	Psychiatry	Public Health
Barouch, Dan H.	Beth Israel Deaconess MC	usa	Virology	Immunology
Lipsitch, Marc	Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health	usa	Microbiology	Epidemiology
Gostin, Lawrence O.	Georgetown Law	usa	Applied Ethics	General & Internal Medicine
Hotez, Peter J.*	Baylor College of Medicine	usa	Tropical Medicine	General & Internal Medicine
Lee, Sherman Aclaracion	Christopher Newport Univ	usa	Clinical Psychology	Social Psychology
Hui, David S.C.	Chinese Univ of Hong Kong	hkg	Respiratory System	Microbiology

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Elfiky, Abdo A.	Cairo Univ	egy	Biophysics	Virology
Baric, Ralph	Univ of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	usa	Virology	Microbiology
Cao, Bin	China-Japan Friendship Hospital	chn	Microbiology	Respiratory System
MacIntyre, Chandini R.	UNSW Sydney	aus	Virology	Microbiology
McKee, Martin*	LSHTM	gbr	Public Health	General & Internal Medicine
Cowling, Benjamin J.	Univ of Hong Kong	chn	Microbiology	General & Internal Medicine
Greenberg, Neil	King's College London	gbr	Psychiatry	Environmental & Occupational Health
Galea, Sandro*	Boston Univ School of Public Health	usa	Public Health	Psychiatry
Koopmans, Marion P.G.	Erasmus MC	nld	Microbiology	Virology
Horby, Peter	Univ of Oxford	gbr	Microbiology	General & Internal Medicine
Tang, Ning	Tongji Medical College of Huazhong Univ of Science and Technology	chn	Cardiovascular System & Hem	General Clinical Medicine
Larson, Heidi Jane	LSHTM	gbr	Virology	Public Health
Sallam, Malik	Univ of Jordan	jor	Immunology	General & Internal Medicine
Schwartz, David A.	Perinatal Pathology Consulting	usa	Pathology	Obstetrics & Reproductive Medicine
Fauci, Anthony S.*	NIAID	usa	Immunology	General & Internal Medicine
Cook, T. M.	Royal United Hospitals Bath NHS Foundation Trust	gbr	Anesthesiology	General & Internal Medicine

Univ: University; MC: Medical Center; Hem: Hematology; * citations to COVID-19-related items accounting for <30% of total citations received in 2020-first part of 2024

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. A. Monthly COVID-19 related publications in 2020-first part of 2024. B.

Percentage of COVID-19-related publications in 2020-first part of 2024 among all science

publications. C. Percentage of annual Zika, H1N1, and Ebola-related publications among all

science publications. D. Percentage of annual Zika, H1N1, and Ebola-related publications

among all science publications, separating those that are also COVID-19-related.



Figure 2. A. Monthly citations to COVID-19 related publications in 2020-first part of 2024.

B. Percentage of citations to COVID-19 related publications as a proportion of citations given that month to all Scopus publications published in 2020-first part of 2024.





Figure 3. Distribution of citations received during the year of publication to papers published in 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023 according to whether they were COVID-19-related, not COVID-19-related and overall (all science).



REFERENCES

1. Ioannidis JPA, Salholz-Hillel M, Boyack KW, Baas J. The rapid, massive growth of COVID-19 authors in the scientific literature. *R Soc Open Sci.* 2021;8(9):210389.
2. Ioannidis JPA, Baas J, Klavans R, Boyack KW. A standardized citation metrics author database annotated for scientific field. *PLoS Biol.* 2019;17(8):e3000384.
3. Ioannidis JPA, Bendavid E, Salholz-Hillel M, Boyack KW, Baas J. Massive covidization of research citations and the citation elite. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2022;119(28):e2204074119.
4. Delardas O, Giannos P. How COVID-19 Affected the Journal Impact Factor of High Impact Medical Journals: Bibliometric Analysis. *J Med Internet Res.* 2022;24(12):e43089.
5. Pai M. Covidization of research: what are the risks? *Nat. Med.* 2020;26:1159.
6. Adam D. Scientists fear that 'covidization' is distorting research. *Nature* 2020;588:381-382.
7. Ioannidis JPA. The end of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Eur J Clin Invest.* 2022;52(6):e13782.
8. Delwiche FA. Letters to the editor on the Zika virus: a bibliometric analysis. *J Med Libr Assoc.* 2021;109(2):301-310.
9. Maalouf FT, Mdawar B, Meho LI, Akl EA. Mental health research in response to the COVID-19, Ebola, and H1N1 outbreaks: A comparative bibliometric analysis. *J Psychiatr Res.* 2021 Jan;132:198-206.
10. Kawuki J, Yu X, Musa TH. Bibliometric Analysis of Ebola Research Indexed in Web of Science and Scopus (2010-2020). *Biomed Res Int.* 2020 Sep 3;2020:5476567.

11. Zhang L, Zhao W, Sun B, Huang Y, Glänzel W. How scientific research reacts to international public health emergencies: a global analysis of response patterns. *Scientometrics*. 2020;124(1):747-773.
12. Oliveira JF, Pescarini JM, Rodrigues MS, Almeida BA, Henriques CMP, Gouveia FC, Rabello ET, Matta GC, Barreto ML, Sampaio RB. The global scientific research response to the public health emergency of Zika virus infection. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(3):e0229790.
13. Liang F, Guan P, Wu W, Liu J, Zhang N, Zhou BS, Huang DS. A review of documents prepared by international organizations about influenza pandemics, including the 2009 pandemic: a bibliometric analysis. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2018;18(1):383.
14. Hagel C, Weidemann F, Gauch S, Edwards S, Tinnemann P. Analysing published global Ebola Virus Disease research using social network analysis. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2017;11(10):e0005747.
15. Fricke R, Uibel S, Klingelhofer D, Groneberg DA. Influenza: a scientometric and density-equalizing analysis. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2013;13:454.
16. Baas J, Schotten M, Plume A, Côté G, Karimi R. Scopus as a curated, high-quality bibliometric data source for academic research in quantitative science studies. *Quant. Sci. Stud*. 2020;1:377-386.
17. Baas J, Fennel C. When peer reviewers go rogue—estimated prevalence of citation manipulation by reviewers based on the citation patterns of 69000 reviewers. In *Proc. of the 17th Int. Conf. of the Int. Soc. of Scientometrics and Informetrics (ISSI)*, Rome, Italy, 2019, pp. 963.–.
18. Archambault É, Beauchesne OH, Caruso J. 2011. Towards a multilingual, comprehensive and open scientific journal ontology. In *Proc. of the 13th Int. Conf. of*

- the Int. Soc. for Scientometrics and Informetrics (ISSI), Durban, South Africa, pp. 66–77.
19. Baas J, Boyack K, Ioannidis JPA. Data for updated science-wide author databases of standardized citation indicators. 2024, Doi: 10.17632/btchxktzyw.7)
 20. Ioannidis JP, Klavans R, Boyack KW. 2016. Multiple citation indicators and their composite across scientific disciplines. *PLoS Biol.* 14, e1002501.
 21. Ioannidis JPA, Boyack KW, Baas J. Updated science-wide author databases of standardized citation indicators. *PLoS Biol.* 2020;18: e3000918.
 22. Maillard A, Delory T. Blockbuster effect of COVID-19 on the impact factor of infectious disease journals. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 2022 Dec;28(12):1536-1538.
 23. He J, Liu X, Lu X, Zhong M, Jia C, Lucero-Prisno DE 3rd, Ma ZF, Li H. The impact of COVID-19 on global health journals: an analysis of impact factor and publication trends. *BMJ Glob Health.* 2023 Apr;8(4):e011514.
 24. Khatter A, Naughton M, Dambha-Miller H, Redmond P. Is rapid scientific publication also high quality? Bibliometric analysis of highly disseminated COVID-19 research papers. *Learn Publ.*2021; 34:568–577.
 25. Wang D, et al., Abstracts for reports of randomised trials of COVID-19 interventions had low quality and high spin. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2021;139:107–120.
 26. Li Y, et al., Reporting and methodological quality of COVID-19 systematic reviews needs to be improved: An evidence mapping. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2021;135,:17–28.
 27. Quinn TJ, et al. Following the science? Comparison of methodological and reporting quality of covid-19 and other research from the first wave of the pandemic. *BMC Med.* 2021;19:46.

28. Luo X, et al., Consistency of recommendations and methodological quality of guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of COVID-19. *J. Evid. Based Med.* 2021;14:40–55.
29. Yang S, et al., Quality of early evidence on the pathogenesis, diagnosis, prognosis and treatment of COVID-19. *BMJ Evid. Based Med.* 2021;26:302–306.
30. Nieto I, Navas JF, Vázquez C. The quality of research on mental health related to the COVID-19 pandemic: A note of caution after a systematic review. *Brain Behav Immun Health* 2020;7:100123.
31. Chu JSG, Evans JA. Slowed canonical progress in large fields of science. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2021 Oct 12;118(41):e2021636118.
32. Ioannidis JPA. Prolific non-research authors in high impact scientific journals: meta-research study. *Scientometrics.* 2023;128(5):3171-3184.
33. Kepp KP, Cristea IA, Muka T, Ioannidis JPA. COVID-19 advocacy bias in the BMJ: meta-research evaluation. medRxiv 2024.06.12.24308823; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.12.24308823>.
34. Kepp KP, Aavitsland P, Ballin M, Balloux F, Baral S, Bardosh K, Bauchner H, Bendavid E, Bhopal R, Blumstein DT, Boffetta P, Bourgeois F, Brufsky A, Collignon PJ, Cripps S, Cristea IA, Curtis N, Djulbegovic B, Faude O, Flacco ME, Guyatt GH, Hajishengallis G, Hemkens LG, Hoffmann T, Joffe AR, Klassen TP, Koletsi D, Kontoyiannis DP, Kuhl E, La Vecchia C, Lallukka T, Lambris J, Levitt M, Makridakis S, Maltezou HC, Manzoli L, Marusic A, Mavragani C, Moher D, Mol BW, Muka T, Naudet F, Noble PW, Nordström A, Nordström P, Pandis N, Papatheodorou S, Patel CJ, Petersen I, Pilz S, Plesnila N, Ponsonby AL, Rivas MA, Saltelli A, Schabus M, Schippers MC, Schünemann H, Solmi M, Stang A, Streeck H, Sturmberg JP, Thabane L, Thombs BD, Tsakris A, Wood SN, Ioannidis JPA. Panel

stacking is a threat to consensus statement validity. J Clin Epidemiol.

2024;173:111428.

Supplementary Table 1. Top-300 authors with highest composite citation indicator for COVID-19-related published items during 2020-2024, excluding self-citations.

AUTHOR	AFFILIATION		PRIMARY SUBFIELD	% COVID citations of career-long citations
Mahase, Elisabeth*	British Medical Journal	gbr	General & Internal Medicine	72%
The Lancet*				47%
Krammer, Florian	Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai	usa	Virology	58%
Callaway, Ewen*	Caring in Bristol Ltd	gbr	Developmental Biology	46%
Ivanov, Dmitry	Hochschule für Wirtschaft und Recht Berlin	deu	Operations Research	32%
Henry, Brandon M.	Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center	usa	General Clinical Medicine	76%
Burki, Talha*			General & Internal Medicine	48%
Lu, Hongzhou	Second Affiliated Hospital of Southern University of Science and Technology	chn	Microbiology	60%
Coccia, Mario*	Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche	ita	Business & Management	39%
Ledford, Heidi*			General & Internal Medicine	70%
Lippi, Giuseppe	Università degli Studi di Verona	ita	General Clinical Medicine	27%
Ioannidis, John P.A.	Stanford University	usa	General & Internal Medicine	1%
Wise, Jacqui*	Kent	gbr	General & Internal Medicine	47%
Greenhalgh, Trisha	University of Oxford Medical Sciences Division	gbr	General & Internal Medicine	13%
Iacobucci, Gareth*	BMJ		General & Internal Medicine	48%
Thachil, Jecko	The University of Manchester	gbr	Cardiovascular System &	45%

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

			Hematology	
Mallapaty, Smriti*	Nature	gbr	Virology	48%
Wilder-Smith, Annelies	Organisation Mondiale de la Santé	che	Tropical Medicine	91%
Iwasaki, Akiko	Yale School of Medicine	usa	Immunology	25%
Dyer, Owen*	BMJ		General & Internal Medicine	57%
Perlman, Stanley	University of Iowa Carver College of Medicine	usa	Virology	29%
Jiang, Shibo	Fudan University	chn	Virology	29%
Taylor, Steven	The University of British Columbia	can	Clinical Psychology	21%
Banerjee, Debanjan**	Apollo Multispecialty Hospitals	ind	Psychiatry	93%
Rajkumar, Ravi Philip	Jawaharlal Institute of Postgraduate Medical Education and Research	ind	Psychiatry	62%
Graham, Barney S.	National Institutes of Health (NIH)	usa	Immunology	93%
Ludvigsson, Jonas F.	Karolinska Institutet	swe	Gastroenterology & Hepatology	8%
Lin, Chung Ying	National Cheng Kung University	twn	Psychiatry	48%
Barouch, Dan H.	Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center	usa	Virology	30%
Lipsitch, Marc	Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health	usa	Microbiology	30%
Rubin, Rita*	Lead Senior Staff Writer		General & Internal Medicine	50%
Gostin, Lawrence O.	Georgetown Law	usa	Applied Ethics	28%
Hotez, Peter J.	Baylor College of Medicine	usa	Tropical Medicine	4%
Lee, Sherman Aclaracion	Christopher Newport University	usa	Clinical Psychology	72%
Hui, David S.C.	Chinese University of Hong	hkg	Respiratory System	52%

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

	Kong			
Elfiky, Abdo A.	Cairo University	egy	Biophysics	71%
Horton, Richard*	The Lancet	gbr	General & Internal Medicine	6%
Baric, Ralph	The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	usa	Virology	39%
Torjesen, Ingrid*	BMJ		General & Internal Medicine	48%
Abbasi, Jennifer*	Journal of American Medical Association	usa	General & Internal Medicine	48%
Ratten, Vanessa*	La Trobe University	aus	Business & Management	20%
Kupferschmidt, Kai*	Polines	col	General & Internal Medicine	62%
Cao, Bin	China-Japan Friendship Hospital	chn	Microbiology	82%
MacIntyre, Chandini R.	UNSW Sydney	aus	Virology	21%
McKee, Martin	London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine	gbr	Public Health	5%
Cowling, Benjamin J.	The University of Hong Kong	chn	Microbiology	50%
Greenberg, Neil	King's College London	gbr	Psychiatry	54%
Galea, Sandro	School of Public Health	usa	Public Health	9%
Koopmans, Marion P.G.	Erasmus MC	nld	Microbiology	31%
Horby, Peter	University of Oxford	gbr	Microbiology	75%
Tang, Ning	Tongji Medical College of Huazhong University of Science and Technology	chn	Cardiovascular System & Hematology	98%
Larson, Heidi Jane	London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine	gbr	Virology	24%
Sallam, Malik	The University of Jordan	jor	Immunology	68%
Schwartz, David A.	Perinatal Pathology Consulting	usa	Pathology	29%
Fauci, Anthony S.**	National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases	usa	Immunology	3%

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

	(NIAID)			
Cook, T. M.	Royal United Hospitals Bath NHS Foundation Trust	gbr	Anesthesiology	15%
Chan, Jasper Fuk Woo	The University of Hong Kong	chn	Microbiology	63%
Hoffmann, Markus	Deutsches Primatenzentrum	deu	Virology	95%
Al-Tawfiq, Jaffar A.	Johns Hopkins Aramco Healthcare	sau	Microbiology	23%
Cohen, Jon*	Momentive	usa	General & Internal Medicine	24%
Labrague, Leodoro Jabien	Loyola University Chicago	usa	Nursing	42%
Yancy, Clyde W.**	Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine	usa	Cardiovascular System & Hematology	2%
Moss, Paul	University of Birmingham	gbr	Immunology	13%
Baig, Abdul Mannan	The Aga Khan University	pak	Neurology & Neurosurgery	84%
Guan, Wei Jie	Guangzhou Medical University	chn	Respiratory System	89%
Nishiura, Hiroshi	Kyoto University School of Public Health	jpn	Microbiology	47%
Goodell, John W.	University of Akron	usa	Finance	43%
Raoult, Didier	Aix Marseille Université	fra	Microbiology	9%
Gao, George F.	Chinese Academy of Sciences	chn	Virology	53%
Brodin, Petter	Karolinska Institutet	swe	Immunology	57%
Ladhani, Shamez N.	UK Health Security Agency	gbr	Microbiology	46%
Plebani, Mario	Università degli Studi di Padova	ita	General Clinical Medicine	14%
To, Kelvin Kai Wang	The University of Hong Kong	chn	Microbiology	68%
Levi, Marcel	Amsterdam UMC - University of Amsterdam	nld	Cardiovascular System & Hematology	13%
Pal, Rimesh	Postgraduate Institute of	ind	Endocrinology &	82%

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

	Medical Education & Research, Chandigarh		Metabolism	
Abdool Karim, Salim S.**	University of KwaZulu-Natal	zaf	Virology	16%
Rodriguez-Morales, Alfonso J.	Universidad Científica del Sur	per	Microbiology	55%
Casadevall, Arturo	Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health	usa	Microbiology	9%
Mamun, Mohammed A.	Jahangirnagar University	bgd	Psychiatry	66%
Huynh, Luu Duc Toan	Queen Mary University of London	gbr	Economics	47%
Abbas, Jaffar	Shanghai Jiao Tong University	chn	General & Internal Medicine	51%
Singhal, Tanu	Kokilaben Dhirubhai Ambani Hospital and Medical Research Institute	ind	Pediatrics	56%
Khunti, Kamlesh	University of Leicester	gbr	Endocrinology & Metabolism	21%
Topol, Eric J.	Scripps Translational Science Institute	usa	Cardiovascular System & Hematology	3%
Dhama, Kuldeep	Indian Veterinary Research Institute	ind	Dairy & Animal Science	40%
Holmes, Edward C.	The University of Sydney	aus	Virology	30%
Crotty, Shane	La Jolla Institute for Immunology	usa	Immunology	30%
Day, Michael*			General & Internal Medicine	85%
Shimabukuro, Tom T.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention	usa	Virology	66%
Narayan, Paresh Kumar	Monash University	aus	Economics	9%
Buonsenso, Danilo	Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Agostino Gemelli IRCCS	ita	Pediatrics	77%

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Sher, Leo	Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai	usa	Psychiatry	17%
Angus, Derek C.	University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine	usa	Emergency & Critical Care Medicine	7%
Fernández-de-las-Peñas, César	Universidad Rey Juan Carlos	esp	Orthopedics	10%
Lewis, Dyani*	University of Melbourne	aus	Artificial Intelligence & Image Processing	55%
Klompas, Michael	Harvard Pilgrim Health Care Institute	usa	Microbiology	11%
Huang, Chaolin	Tongji Medical College of Huazhong University of Science and Technology	chn	Immunology	99%
Al-Aly, Ziyad	Washington University in St. Louis	usa	General & Internal Medicine	5%
van der Linden, Sander	University of Cambridge	gbr	Social Psychology	45%
Kalil, Andre C.	University of Nebraska Medical Center	usa	Microbiology	42%
Baden, Lindsey R.	Brigham and Women's Hospital	usa	Microbiology	49%
Maxmen, Amy*	Pulitzer Center on Crisis Reporting	usa	General & Internal Medicine	39%
Corman, Victor M.	Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin	deu	Microbiology	65%
Heymann, David**	London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine	gbr	General & Internal Medicine	30%
Rosenbaum, Lisa*	Brigham and Women's Hospital	usa	General & Internal Medicine	44%
Kampf, G.	Universitätsmedizin Greifswald	deu	Epidemiology	30%
Wang, Chen	Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences & Peking Union	chn	Respiratory System	51%

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

	Medical College			
Zhao, Shi	Tianjin Medical University	chn	Microbiology	84%
Tang, Julian W.	University of Leicester	gbr	Microbiology	46%
Shoenfeld, Yehuda	Chaim Sheba Medical Center Israel	isr	Immunology	4%
Tanne, Janice* Hopkins	not available		General & Internal Medicine	47%
Rezaei, Nima	Tehran University of Medical Sciences	irn	Immunology	12%
Dolgin, Elie*	Science journalist	usa	Biotechnology	26%
Bourouiba, Lydia	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	usa	Fluids & Plasmas	51%
Hung, Ivan F.N.	The University of Hong Kong	hkg	Microbiology	51%
Gössling, Stefan	Vestlandsforskning	nor	Sport, Leisure & Tourism	21%
Misra, Anoop	Diabetes Foundation (India), New Delhi	ind	Endocrinology & Metabolism	19%
Focosi, Daniele	Azienda Ospedaliero Universitaria Pisana	ita	Virology	39%
Sette, Alessandro	La Jolla Institute for Immunology	usa	Immunology	19%
Ashraf, Badar Nadeem	London South Bank University	gbr	Finance	54%
Bragazzi, Nicola L.	York University	can	General & Internal Medicine	35%
Grasselli, Giacomo	Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico	ita	Emergency & Critical Care Medicine	69%
The Lancet Infectious Diseases*				65%
Volkow, Nora D.	National Institutes of Health (NIH)	usa	Neurology & Neurosurgery	2%
Gautret, Philippe	AP-HM Assistance Publique - Hôpitaux de Marseille	fra	Microbiology	49%
Li, Yuguo	The University of Hong Kong	chn	Building & Construction	15%

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Adam, David*			Legal & Forensic Medicine	84%
Li, Taisheng	Peking Union Medical College Hospital	chn	Virology	42%
Becker, Richard C.*	University of Cincinnati College of Medicine	usa	Cardiovascular System & Hematology	2%
Sharifi, Ayyoob	Hiroshima University	jpn	Energy	19%
Chirico, Francesco	Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Campus di Roma	ita	Public Health	63%
Galanakis, Charis M.	Taif University	sau	Food Science	20%
Armitage, Richard**	University of Nottingham	gbr	Public Health	92%
Kanne, Jeffrey P.	University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health	usa	Nuclear Medicine & Medical Imaging	44%
Gautam, Sneha	Karunya Institute of Technology and Sciences	ind	Environmental Sciences	42%
Atangana, Abdon	University of the Free State	zaf	Applied Mathematics	9%
Xiang, Yu Tao**	University of Macau	chn	Psychiatry	41%
Zarocostas, John*	Freelance journalist	che	General & Internal Medicine	70%
Solomon, Tom	University of Liverpool	gbr	Neurology & Neurosurgery	32%
Lai, Chih Cheng	Chi Mei Medical Center	twn	Microbiology	52%
Koh, David S.Q.	National University of Singapore	sgp	General & Internal Medicine	6%
Nkengasong, John	US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief	usa	Virology	20%
Fancourt, Daisy	University College London	gbr	Public Health	65%
Mukhtar, Sonia**	Dulwich Centre	aus	Public Health	98%
Asadi-Pooya, Ali A.	Thomas Jefferson University	usa	Neurology & Neurosurgery	10%
Vaishya, Raju	Indraprastha Apollo Hospitals	ind	Orthopedics	64%
Parums, Dinah V.*	International Scientific Information, Inc.	usa	Cardiovascular System & Hematology	36%

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Curigliano, Giuseppe	Istituto Europeo di Oncologia	ita	Oncology & Carcinogenesis	7%
Poland, Gregory A.	Mayo Clinic	usa	Virology	8%
Kucharski, Adam	London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine	gbr	Microbiology	85%
del Rio, Carlos	Emory University School of Medicine	usa	Virology	34%
Sheikh, Aziz	The University of Edinburgh	gbr	General & Internal Medicine	8%
Higgins-Desbiolles, Freya	University of South Australia	aus	Sport, Leisure & Tourism	32%
Eyre, David W.	University of Oxford	gbr	Microbiology	61%
Moorhouse, Benjamin Luke	Hong Kong Baptist University	hkg	Education	68%
Zhou, Peng	Guangzhou Lab	chn	Virology	85%
Hopkins, Claire	Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust	gbr	Otorhinolaryngology	26%
Choi, Tsan Ming	University of Liverpool Management School	gbr	Operations Research	6%
Finsterer, Josef	Neurology & Neurophysiology Center	aut	Cardiovascular System & Hematology	6%
Bontempi, Elza	Università degli Studi di Brescia	ita	Applied Physics	12%
Tan, Wen jie	Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention	chn	Virology	90%
Thornton, Jacqui*			General & Internal Medicine	79%
Murray, Christopher J.L.	University of Washington	usa	General & Internal Medicine	9%
Wu, Joseph T.	The University of Hong Kong	hkg	Microbiology	77%
Rimmer, Abi*	British Medical Journal	gbr	General & Internal Medicine	33%
Taylor, Luke*	Bogotá	col	General & Internal Medicine	75%
Thompson, R.	University of Oxford	gbr	Bioinformatics	60%
Phelan, Alexandra L.**	Johns Hopkins University	usa	General & Internal Medicine	83%

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Walls, Alexandra C.	University of Washington	usa	Developmental Biology	87%
Gupta, Ravindra K.	University of Cambridge	gbr	Microbiology	68%
D'Antiga, L.	Papa Giovanni XXIII Hospital	ita	Gastroenterology & Hepatology	43%
Alwan, Nisreen A.	University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust	gbr	General & Internal Medicine	41%
Lechien, Jerome	Université de Mons	bel	Otorhinolaryngology	59%
Beigel, John	National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID)	usa	Microbiology	73%
Favaloro, Emmanuel J.	Westmead Hospital	aus	Cardiovascular System & Hematology	18%
Tobias, Aurelio	CSIC - Instituto de Diagnostico Ambiental y Estudios del Agua (IDAEA)	esp	Toxicology	11%
Bloom, Jesse D.	Howard Hughes Medical Institute	usa	Virology	46%
Munster, Vincent J.	National Institutes of Health (NIH)	usa	Virology	48%
Young, Barnaby Edward	Tan Tock Seng Hospital	sgp	Microbiology	87%
Ramkissoon, Haywantee	University of South Australia	aus	Sport, Leisure & Tourism	11%
Kirby, Tony*			Respiratory System	89%
Leung, Gabriel M.	The University of Hong Kong	hkg	General & Internal Medicine	49%
Madhi, Shabir A.	University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg	zaf	Microbiology	20%
Tobin, Martin J.	Loyola University Chicago	usa	Respiratory System	6%
Emanuel, Ezekiel J.	University of Pennsylvania	usa	General & Internal Medicine	10%
Lundstrom, Kenneth	PanTherapeutics	che	Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	15%

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Meo, Sultan Ayoub	King Saud University	sau	General & Internal Medicine	39%
Bastard, Paul	l'Institut des Maladies Génétiques Imagine	Fra	Immunology	91%
Singh, Awadhesh Kumar	Sun Valley Diabetes Hospital	ind	Endocrinology & Metabolism	82%
Recalcati, Sebastiano**	Azienda Ospedaliera Ospedale Di Lecco	Ita	Dermatology & Venereal Diseases	84%
Diamond, Michael S.	Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis	usa	Virology	21%
Mbunge, Elliot	University of Eswatini	zaf	Artificial Intelligence & Image Processing	86%
Zhong, Nanshan	Guangzhou Medical University	chn	Respiratory System	53%
Wang, Youchun	Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences & Peking Union Medical College	chn	Virology	72%
Yousaf, Imran	Wenzhou-Kean University	chn	Finance	52%
Subbarao, Kanta	University of Melbourne	aus	Virology	17%
Grifoni, Alba	La Jolla Institute for Immunology	usa	Immunology	91%
The Lancet Public Health*				51%
Pranata, Raymond	Universitas Padjadjaran	idn	Cardiovascular System & Hematology	86%
Sarkis, Joseph**	Worcester Polytechnic Institute	usa	Business & Management	3%
Mauvais-Jarvis, Franck	Tulane University School of Medicine	usa	Endocrinology & Metabolism	14%
Omer, Saad B.	UT Southwestern Medical Center	usa	Virology	12%
Brüssow, Harald*	KU Leuven	bel	Microbiology	4%
Betsch, Cornelia	Universität Erfurt	deu	Public Health	20%
Kuehn, Bridget			General & Internal Medicine	6%

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

M.*				
Poon, Leo L.M.	The University of Hong Kong	hkg	Virology	31%
Amankwah- Amoah, Joseph	Durham University	fin	Business & Management	24%
Bikdeli, Behnood	Harvard Medical School	usa	Cardiovascular System & Hematology	82%
Connors, Jean M.	Brigham and Women's Hospital	usa	Cardiovascular System & Hematology	55%
Riad, Abanoub	Masaryk University	cze	Toxicology	59%
Petersen, Eskild**	Roskilde Universitet	dnk	Microbiology	88%
Hoeningl, Martin	Medizinische Universität Graz	aut	Microbiology	27%
Zumla, Alimuddin	University College London	gbr	Microbiology	19%
Asmundson, Gordon J.G.	University of Regina	can	Clinical Psychology	16%
Griffiths, Mark D.	Nottingham Trent University	gbr	Substance Abuse	13%
Rubin, G. James	King's College London	gbr	Public Health	67%
Baraniuk, Chris*	Belfast	gbr	General & Internal Medicine	95%
Andrews, Nick	UK Health Security Agency	gbr	Microbiology	30%
Cao, Xuetao**	Institute of Basic Medical Sciences, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences & Peking Union Medical College	chn	Immunology	4%
Theoharides, Theoharis C.	Tufts University School of Medicine	usa	Immunology	3%
Lavie, Carl J.	Ochsner Health	usa	Cardiovascular System & Hematology	50%
Calder, Philip C.	University of Southampton	gbr	Nutrition & Dietetics	3%
Santosh, K. C.	University of South Dakota	usa	Artificial Intelligence & Image Processing	30%
Wichmann, Dominic	Universitätsklinikum Hamburg-Eppendorf	deu	Microbiology	66%
Rambaut, A.	The University of Edinburgh	gbr	Microbiology	22%
Smith, Lee	Anglia Ruskin University	gbr	Psychiatry	33%

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Krieger, Nancy	Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health	usa	Public Health	3%
Wadman, Meredith*			Neurology & Neurosurgery	77%
Lim, Michael	John Radcliffe Hospital	gbr	Endocrinology & Metabolism	94%
Kraemer, Moritz U.G.	University of Oxford	gbr	Microbiology	39%
Sheth, Jagdish N.	Emory University	usa	Marketing	9%
Savulescu, Julian	National University of Singapore	sgp	Applied Ethics	6%
Ali, Nurshad	Shahjalal University of Science and Technology	bgd	Toxicology	28%
Ho, Cyrus S.H.	National University of Singapore	sgp	Toxicology	66%
Ayalon, Liat	Bar-Ilan University	isr	Gerontology	10%
Volz, Erik M.	Imperial College London	gbr	Microbiology	95%
Barcelo, Damia	CSIC - Instituto de Diagnostico Ambiental y Estudios del Agua (IDAEA)	esp	Analytical Chemistry	2%
Fan, Bingwen E.**	Tan Tock Seng Hospital	sgp	Cardiovascular System & Hematology	90%
Giamarellos-Bourboulis, Evangelos J.	National and Kapodistrian University of Athens	grc	Microbiology	21%
Wang, Yeming	China-Japan Friendship Hospital	chn	Microbiology	99%
Nepogodiev, Dmitri	University of Birmingham	gbr	Surgery	52%
Abu-Raddad, Laith J.	Weill Cornell Medicine-Qatar	qat	General & Internal Medicine	7%
Dalakas, Marinos C.	Thomas Jefferson University	usa	Neurology & Neurosurgery	58%

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Douglas, Karen M.	University of Kent	gbr	Social Psychology	34%
Altmann, Daniel M.	Imperial College London	gbr	Immunology	30%
Mehra, Mandeep R.**	Brigham and Women's Hospital	usa	Cardiovascular System & Hematology	31%
Gurwitz, David*	Tel Aviv University	isr	Pharmacology & Pharmacy	11%
Haynes, Barton F.	Duke University School of Medicine	usa	Immunology	53%
Ho, Roger	National University of Singapore	sgp	Psychiatry	52%
Gattinoni, Luciano**	Universitätsmedizin Göttingen	deu	Emergency & Critical Care Medicine	10%
Morawska, Lidia	Queensland University of Technology	aus	Environmental Sciences	4%
van Doremalen, Neeltje**	National Institutes of Health (NIH)	usa	Virology	70%
Abbasi, Kamran*	British Medical Journal	gbr	General & Internal Medicine	30%
Mehta, P.**	University College London	gbr	Arthritis & Rheumatology	94%
Grabowski, David C.	Harvard Medical School	usa	Health Policy & Services	17%
Anderson, Evan J.	Emory University	usa	Microbiology	78%
Czeisler, Mark	Harvard Medical School	usa	General & Internal Medicine	100%
Mulligan, Mark J.	NYU Grossman School of Medicine	usa	Virology	46%
Brooks, Samantha K.	King's College London	gbr	Psychiatry	85%
Wiwanitkit, Viroj**	Chandigarh University	ind	Tropical Medicine	32%
Cyranoski, David*	Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Biology	jpn	Developmental Biology	9%
Greninger, Alexander L.	University of Washington	usa	Microbiology	58%
Banerjee, Amitava	University College London	gbr	General & Internal Medicine	8%

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Nath, Avindra	National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke	usa	Neurology & Neurosurgery	5%
Varga, Zsuzsanna**	UniversitätsSpital Zurich	che	Oncology & Carcinogenesis	40%
Yong, Shin Jie	Sunway University	mys	Neurology & Neurosurgery	89%
Sigala, Marianna	The University of Newcastle, Australia	aus	Sport, Leisure & Tourism	16%
Netea, Mihai G.	Radboud University Medical Center	nld	Immunology	8%
Spyropoulos, Alex C.	Donald and Barbara Zucker School of Medicine at Hofstra/Northwell	usa	Cardiovascular System & Hematology	20%
Zhou, Fei	China-Japan Friendship Hospital	chn	Respiratory System	99%
Cheshmehzangi, Ali	Hiroshima University	jpn	Energy	39%
Klok, Frederikus A.	Leids Universitair Medisch Centrum	nld	Cardiovascular System & Hematology	40%
Cutler, David**	Harvard University	usa	Health Policy & Services	4%
Neurath, Markus F.	Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg	deu	Gastroenterology & Hepatology	2%
Baber, Hasnan	American University of Sharjah	are	Business & Management	58%
Harapan, Harapan	Universitas Syiah Kuala	idn	Virology	67%
Wenham, Clare**	London School of Economics and Political Science	gbr	General & Internal Medicine	72%
de Bruin, Wändi Bruine	University of Southern California	usa	Experimental Psychology	12%
Yuen, Kwok Yung	The University of Hong Kong	chn	Microbiology	39%
Colson, Philippe	AP-HM Assistance Publique - Hôpitaux de Marseille	fra	Microbiology	49%
Hensher, David A.	The University of Sydney	aus	Logistics & Transportation	5%

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

	Business School			
McGonagle, Dennis	University of Leeds	gbr	Arthritis & Rheumatology	9%
Gandhi, Rajesh T.	Massachusetts General Hospital	usa	Virology	25%
Looi, Mun Keat*	British Medical Journal	gbr	General & Internal Medicine	84%
Pakpour, Amir H.	Jönköping University	swe	Neurology & Neurosurgery	17%
Binnicker, Matthew J.	Mayo Clinic	usa	Microbiology	20%
Alter, Galit	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	usa	Immunology	36%
Amanat, Fatima	Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai	usa	Microbiology	89%
Bhopal, Raj**	The University of Edinburgh	gbr	Public Health	7%
Liang, Wenhua	Guangzhou Medical University	chn	Oncology & Carcinogenesis	84%
Buckee, Caroline O.	Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health	usa	Tropical Medicine	22%
Brufsky, Adam	University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine	usa	Oncology & Carcinogenesis	3%
Haleem, Abid	Jamia Millia Islamia	ind	Business & Management	27%
Liu, Yingxia	Second Affiliated Hospital of Southern University of Science and Technology	chn	Virology	75%
Iba, Toshiaki	Juntendo University Graduate School of Medicine	jpn	Cardiovascular System & Hematology	44%
Ye, Qing	Zhejiang University School of Medicine	chn	Virology	83%
Prescott, Hallie C.	University of Michigan, Ann Arbor	usa	Emergency & Critical Care Medicine	36%
Pfefferbaum, Betty	University of Oklahoma College of Medicine	usa	Psychiatry	21%
Yıldırım, Murat	Arı İbrahim een	tur	Public Health	83%

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#) .

	Universitesi			
Martins-Filho, Paulo Ricardo	Université Fédérale de Sergipe	bra	Dentistry	36%

*editor, journalist or columnist with most of all COVID-19 citation impact related to that role **>50% of citations to COVID-10-related publications given to items that were not full papers (articles/reviews/conference papers).