

## PERFORMANCE OF RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY ON DIGITAL ARCHITECTURE BASED ON WEB OF SCIENCE DATABASE: A SCIENTOMETRIC ANALYSIS

C. RANGANATHAN

Assistant Professor,  
Department of Library and Information Science  
Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli-24, TamilNadu  
e-mail: [cranganathan72@gmail.com](mailto:cranganathan72@gmail.com),

### ABSTRACT

*The study deals with the Scientometric study on the publication of "Digital Architecture". The records are collected from Web of Science Databases for the period of 1999-2013. A total of 6335 papers were identified in Web of Science database. The study reveals that, most of the researchers preferred to publish their research results in journals; as such 79.41% of articles were published in journals. More numbers of articles were published in the year 2012. The authorship trend shows that, out of total 6335 literature published, 89% of the publication published under the joint author. It is observed that author productivity is not in agreement with Lotka's law, but productivity distribution data partially fits the law when the value of Chi-square to 727.37. Further this study also identified to analyses coverage growth rates, coverage growth rates, source-wise. Degree of collaboration, Areas of research concentration, word frequency, Geographical distribution of the literature and citation analysis is also noted.*

**Keyword:** Digital Architecture, Scientometrics, Bradford's law, Web of Science, Architecture

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Digital technology of the current age has grown so boundlessly that it is triggering a radical change throughout culture, art, science and lifestyle. It has rapidly penetrated into our everyday lives. Of the three fundamental human needs - clothing, housing and food - the first two appear to have various phases of digital evolution. Meanwhile, urban spaces, including architecture, are carefully seeking their role as electronic interfaces. The new environment, created by digital technology, has freed humanity from the borders of physical limits of time and space. It is now transforming this era's paradigm of value: from being static to diversion, materialism to immaterialism, heaviness to lightness, logical relationship to indefiniteness and clarity to obscurity. Architecture is restructured according to the contents within an electronic world, and the image of structured space expresses these contents. The digital architecture can be defined as 'an architecture which eliminates geometrical artificiality by creating non-geometrical space, as digital information and human perception meet and handle multidimensional space'.

The major focus of the study is to apply the scientometric analysis with a view to analyse the evaluation and growth and development of research out put in Digital Architecture. This study related to authors and their productivity; collaborative patterns and other aspects is important and useful to understand the mechanism underlying the growth of knowledge of a discipline. This

study also to analyse the evaluation growth and development and of Digital Architecture research output interims of its content and coverage relative growth rates, doubling time, Source wise. Degree of collaboration, Collaborative index, Areas of research concentration, author productivity, authorship Pattern, and word frequency and citation analysis is also noted.

## **2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

1. To examines the growth of literature in Digital architecture in scientometric analysis during the period from 1999 to 2013.
2. To examine the various sources of research publications in digital architecture.
3. To examine the premier institutions, publishing the research output in digital architecture research.
4. To identify the nature of Authorship pattern and determine the degree of collabration.
5. To identify the proportion of single and multi-authored papers of digital architecture research output.
6. To prepare a ranking list of core journals.
7. To test the applicability of Lotka's law to the scientific productivity of authors.
8. To identify the Country wise research output performance in Digital architecture in bibliometrics.
9. To identify the word frequency research output in Digital architecture.

## **3. METHODOLOGY**

The present study is carried out about source documents and research output. The data for the study was downloaded from the web of science database in May 2013. All the Publications retrieved from the Scopus database on Digital Architecture and cover the period from 1999 to 2013, Further; the research has downloaded the bibliographical data in the form of notepad files. Then the bibliographical details are converted to using Histcite software. Overall data retrieved by the researcher are 6335 records and the researcher chosen only 6335 records for analyzing the present study.

## **4. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION**

### **4.1 GROWTH OF PUBLICATION RESEARCH OUTPUT AND CITATION SCORES**

To analysis the year wise publication of research on digital architecture, the data has been presented in the above table-1.It could clearly see that during the period 1999 - 2013 a total of 6335 publications were published in Global level within the fifteen years. Highest percentage of papers were published in the year 2012, 2011 and 2009 constituting 9.39 % and 8.71% and 8.70% respectively. The highest publication is 595 in the year of 2012 with 366 Global Citation Scores followed by 552papers in 2011 with 1205 Global Citation Scores. The lowest publication is 288 in 2001 with 4003 Global Citation Scores. But the publication is 319 in 2002 with highest Global Citation Scores (6832). It shows that even minimum numbers of records were scored higher global citations. The study also reveals all these 6335 publications have 57883 cited references it shows that there is a healthy trend in citing reference is found among the Scientists belongs to digital architecture.

**Table -1: Year Wise Distribution of the Research Output and Citation Scores**

No	<u>Publication of Year</u>	<u>Publication output</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>TLCS</u>	<u>TGCS</u>
1	<b>1999</b>	<u>320</u>	5.05	332	4355
2	<b>2000</b>	<u>306</u>	4.83	281	4887
3	<b>2001</b>	<u>288</u>	4.55	228	4003
4	<b>2002</b>	<u>319</u>	5.03	178	6832
5	<b>2003</b>	<u>371</u>	5.86	352	5727
6	<b>2004</b>	<u>370</u>	5.84	368	5440
7	<b>2005</b>	<u>451</u>	7.12	380	5608
8	<b>2006</b>	<u>479</u>	7.56	313	4458
9	<b>2007</b>	<u>449</u>	7.09	368	4940
10	<b>2008</b>	<u>502</u>	7.92	283	4560
11	<b>2009</b>	<u>551</u>	8.70	221	3300
12	<b>2010</b>	<u>530</u>	8.37	135	2179
13	<b>2011</b>	<u>552</u>	8.71	80	1205
14	<b>2012</b>	<u>595</u>	9.39	23	366
15	<b>2013</b>	<u>252</u>	3.98	3	23
<b>Total</b>		<b>6335</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>57883</b>

#### **4.2 GROWTH RATE AND DOUBLING TIME IN DIGITAL ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH OUTPUT**

A study of the growth rate of Digital architecture literature is an important factor in analyzing the research and development in the field. Table-2 indicates the relative growth rate of research output in Digital Architecture at the global level. It is apparent that the relative growth rate has increasing trend or more or less similar trend -0.04 in 1999 to -0.85 in 2013. The mean relative growth rate for the period 1999 and 2005 is worked out to 0.05 and it is 0.91 for the period 2006 – 2013. The overall study period has witnessed a mean relative growth rate of 0.06. Invariably the doubling time for publications of research output in Digital Architecture has increased from -17.32 year in 2000 to 9.9 in 2012. Quite obviously the whole study period has recorded a mean doubling time for publication as 0.24 years. The mean doubling time for the period 1999 to 2006 is worked out to -0.26 years and for the period 2007 to 2013 it is calculated as 0.82 years.

It is evident from the above discussion that the relative growth rate of publication has shown more or less a similar trend. Consequently, the mean doubling time for publication of Digital Architecture has shown an increasing trend.

Table-2 Relative Growth Rate and Doubling Time of Overall Research Output

Year	No. of Output	Cumulative No. of Output	W1	W2	R (a)	Mean R(a)	Doubling Time Dt (a)	Mean Dt(a) 1-2
1999	320	320		5.76				<b>-0.26</b>
2000	306	626	5.76	5.72	-0.04		-17.32	
2001	288	914	5.72	5.66	-0.06		-11.55	
2002	319	1233	5.66	5.76	0.10		6.93	
2003	371	1604	5.76	5.91	0.15		4.62	
2004	370	1974	5.91	5.91	0.00		0	
2005	451	2425	5.91	6.11	0.19		3.64	
2006	479	2904	6.11	6.17	0.06	<b>0.05</b>	11.55	<b>0.82</b>
2007	449	3353	6.17	6.10	-0.06		-11.55	
2008	502	3855	6.10	6.21	0.11		6.3	
2009	551	4406	6.21	6.31	0.09		7.7	
2010	530	4936	6.31	6.27	-0.03		-23.1	
2011	552	5488	6.27	6.31	0.04		17.32	
2012	595	6083	6.31	6.38	0.07		9.9	
2013	252	6335	6.38	5.52	-0.85	<b>0.91</b>	-0.81	
<b>Mean R(a)</b>					<b>0.06</b>		<b>0.24 years</b>	

#### 4.3 DOCUMENT WISE RESEARCH OUTPUT

A study of data in table-3 indicates the source wise distribution of research output in Digital Architecture has observed a total of 6335 publications in Digital Architecture during the period of ten years from 1999 to 2013. The publications of research output are not uniform throughout the study period. It could be noted that out of 6335 publications, articles from journals constitute 79.41 per cent, articles from conference proceedings constitute 17.99 percent of the total publications and 1.44 per cent, and followed by Book Review 0.35 per cent, and Book Chapter 0.15 percent respectively. It could be deciphered from the above discussion that out of the various sources of research output in Digital architecture. The articles appeared in the journals rank first on order followed by conference papers, review, editorial material, reprint and others in that order. In general, publications of journal article form have attracted a large number of Digital architecture scientists. The reason is that the publication of research output in journals has a great level of significance and dissemination effected throughout the world than other sources.

Table 3 - Source Wise Research Output in Years

Year	Articles	Proceeding Papers	Reviews	Book Reviews	Edit. Materials	Book Chapter	Others	Total
1999	253 (79.06)	61 (19.06)	2 (0.62)	1 (0.31)	-	-	3 (0.93)	320 (5.05)
2000	226 (73.85)	69 (22.54)	3 (0.98)	1 (0.32)	-	-	7 (2.28)	306 (4.83)
2001	205 (71.18)	72 (25.0)	6 (2.08)	-	1 (0.34)	-	4 (1.08)	288 (4.54)
2002	227 (71.15)	86 (26.95)	3 (0.94)	1 (0.31)	2 (0.62)	-	0	319 (5.03)
2003	251 (67.65)	114 (30.72)	6 (1.61)	-	-	-	0	371 (5.85)
2004	224 (60.54)	134 (36.21)	5 (1.35)	3 (0.81)	1 (0.27)	-	2 (0.54)	370 (5.84)
2005	300 (66.51)	146 (32.37)	3 (0.66)	-	1 (0.22)	-	1 (0.22)	451 (7.11)
2006	341 (71.18)	128 (26.72)	5 (1.04)	2 (0.41)	1 (0.20)	-	2 (0.41)	479 (7.56)
2007	363 (80.84)	74 (16.48)	3 (0.66)	2 (0.44)	4 (0.89)	2 (0.44)	2 (0.44)	449 (7.08)
2008	402 (80.07)	82 (16.33)	13 (2.58)	-	2 (0.39)	1 (0.19)	2 (0.39)	502 (7.92)
2009	471 (85.48)	63 (11.43)	12 (2.17)	2 (0.36)	1 (0.18)	-	1 (0.18)	551 (8.69)
2010	466 (87.92)	52 (9.81)	7 (1.32)	2 (0.37)	-	2 (0.37)	1 (0.18)	530 (8.36)
2011	502 (90.94)	33 (5.97)	8 (1.44)	5 (0.90)	1 (0.18)	3 (0.54)	0	552 (8.71)
2012	565 (94.9)	15 (2.52)	10 (1.68)	3 (0.50)	-	2 (0.33)	0	595 (9.39)
2013	235 (93.25)	11 (4.36)	5 (1.98)	-	1 (0.39)	-	1 (0.39)	252 (3.97)
<b>Total</b>	<b>5031</b> <b>(79.41)</b>	<b>1140</b> <b>(17.99)</b>	<b>91</b> <b>(1.44)</b>	<b>22</b> <b>(0.35)</b>	<b>15</b> <b>(0.24)</b>	<b>10</b> <b>(0.15)</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>6335</b>

#### 4.4 AUTHORSHIP PATTERNS

The table-4 indicates the authorship pattern of research publication on Digital Architecture research output. It could be noted that three author publications contribute 24.35%, it is followed by Double author publication with 22.05 %, four authorship publications with 17.14%, single author research output with 10.53, five author publications with 10.34%, six authors 5.74% and above ten author research output with 3.39% respectively. From the result we come to know that the multi author publication is the highest compare to single author publication. Out of the fifteen year analysis, year 2012 has recorded the highest publication distribution of 9.39 percent among

the fifteen years. The year 2011 recorded 8.71 percent, year 2009 recorded 8.69 percent, 2010 recorded 8.36 percent and 2008 recorded 7.92 percent respectively. In view of this analysis the following year distribution 2000, 2001 and 2013 have contributed less than five percent on Digital Architecture.

**Table 4 – Showing Year wise Authorship pattern**

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
1999	57 (8.49)	74 (5.29)	72 (4.66)	38 (3.50)	26 (3.98)	16 (4.40)	15 (7.14)	8 (6.4)	3(4)	11 (5.16)	320 (5.05)
2000	62 (9.23)	80 (5.72)	83 (5.37)	49 (4.52)	15 (2.29)	5 (1.37)	5 (2.38)	2 (1.6)	1 (1.33)	4 (1.87)	306 (4.83)
2001	46 (6.85)	83 (5.94)	68 (4.40)	34 (3.13)	19 (2.90)	12 (3.30)	5 (2.38)	5 (4)	6(8)	10 (4.69)	288 (4.54)
2002	38 (5.66)	77 (5.51)	88 (5.69)	53 (4.88)	29 (4.44)	14 (3.85)	8 (3.80)	4 (3.2)	4 (5.33)	4 (1.87)	319 (5.03)
2003	32 (4.76)	94 (6.72)	105 (6.80)	62 (5.71)	29 (4.44)	18 (4.95)	11 (5.23)	7 (5.6)	5 (6.66)	8 (3.75)	371 (5.85)
2004	30 (4.47)	80 (5.72)	116 (7.51)	63 (5.81)	20 (3.06)	17 (4.68)	17 (8.09)	7 (5.6)	4 (5.33)	16 (7.51)	370 (5.84)
2005	52 (7.47)	97 (6.94)	98 (6.34)	88 (8.11)	45 (6.89)	28(7.71)	14 (6.66)	8 (6.4)	5 (6.66)	16 (7.51)	451 (7.11)
2006	42 (6.25)	118 (8.44)	119 (7.70)	71 (6.54)	59 (9.03)	27 (7.43)	13 (6.19)	8 (6.4)	8 (10.66)	14 (6.57)	479 (7.56)
2007	51 (7.60)	112 (8.01)	100 (6.47)	69 (6.36)	43 (6.58)	25 (6.88)	11 (5.23)	12 (9.6)	9(12)	17 (7.98)	449 (7.08)
2008	51 (7.60)	99 (7.08)	128 (8.29)	106 (9.77)	42 (6.43)	31 (8.53)	14 (6.66)	9(7.2)	2 (2.60)	20 (9.38)	502 (7.92)
2009	49 (7.30)	112 (8.01)	127 (8.22)	100 (9.22)	64 (9.80)	37 (10.19)	20 (9.52)	17 (13.6)	7 (9.33)	18 (8.45)	551 (8.69)
2010	47 (7.00)	108 (7.73)	128 (8.29)	102 (9.40)	62 (9.49)	32 (8.81)	20 (9.52)	7 (5.6)	4 (5.33)	20 (9.38)	530 (8.36)
2011	48 (7.15)	114 (8.16)	130 (8.44)	86 (7.93)	82 (12.55)	40 (11.01)	18 (8.57)	13 (10.4)	7 (9.33)	14 (6.54)	552 (8.71)
2012	49 (7.30)	104 (7.44)	130 (8.44)	103 (9.50)	90 (13.78)	43 (11.84)	28 (13.33)	14 (11.2)	7 (9.33)	27 (12.67)	595 (9.39)
2013	17 (2.53)	45 (3.22)	52 (3.36)	60 (5.53)	28(4.28)	18 (4.95)	11 (5.23)	4 (3.2)	3(4)	14 (6.57)	252 (3.97)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>671</b> <b>(10.53)</b>	<b>1397</b> <b>(22.05)</b>	<b>1544</b> <b>(24.35)</b>	<b>1084</b> <b>(17.14)</b>	<b>653</b> <b>(10.34)</b>	<b>363</b> <b>(5.74)</b>	<b>210</b> <b>(3.31)</b>	<b>125</b> <b>(2.00)</b>	<b>75</b> <b>(1.25)</b>	<b>213</b> <b>(3.39)</b>	<b>6335</b> <b>(100)</b>

#### 4.5 SINGLE VS MULTIPLE AUTHORED RESEARCH OUTPUT AND DEGREE OF COLLABORATION

It is observed that the single version multi author research output during the period 1999 to 2013. At the overall level, the single author contributed papers constitute 10.59 per cent of the total publications: where as the remaining majority 89.40 of the papers are contributed by multi authorship. It is inferred from the table -5 that at the aggregate level, the degree of collaboration

is of 0.89 during the study period 1999 to 2013 i.e., that is out of total 6335 literature published, 96% of them or published under the joint author of publications in Digital Architecture research output. The period wise analysis indicates that its level is somewhat less in the first period [1999-2005: 0.86] and it has shown. An increasing trend during the period [2006-13: 0.91]. This brings out clearly the high level of prevalence of collaborative research in Digital Architecture. Based on this study, the result of the degree of collaboration  $C=0.89$  i.e., 89 percent of collaboration authors articles published during the study periods.

**Table-5 Single Vs Multiple Authored Research Output and Degree of Collaboration**

Year	Single Author		Multiple Author		Total (%)	Degree of collaboration	Mean Degree of collaboration
	No. of Out put	Percentage	No. of Out put	Percentage			
1999	57	17.81	263	82.18	320(5.05)	0.82	
2000	62	20.26	244	79.73	306(4.83)	0.79	
2001	46	15.97	242	84.02	288(4.54)	0.84	
2002	38	11.91	281	88.08	319(5.03)	0.88	
2003	32	8.62	339	91.37	371(5.85)	0.91	
2004	30	8.10	340	91.89	370(5.84)	0.91	
2005	52	11.52	399	88.47	451(7.11)	0.88	0.86
2006	42	8.76	437	91.23	479(7.56)	0.91	
2007	51	11.35	398	88.64	449(7.08)	0.88	
2008	51	10.15	451	89.84	502(7.92)	0.89	
2009	49	8.89	502	91.10	551(8.69)	0.91	
2010	47	8.86	483	91.13	530(8.36)	0.91	
2011	48	8.69	504	91.30	552(8.71)	0.91	
2012	49	8.23	546	91.76	595(9.39)	0.91	
2013	17	6.74	235	93.25	252(3.97)	0.93	0.91
<b>Total</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>10.59</b>	<b>5664</b>	<b>89.40</b>	<b>6335</b>	<b>0.89</b>	

#### 4.6 RANKING OF AUTHORS PRODUCTIVITY BASED ON PUBLICATIONS

Table- 6 indicates ranking of authors by number of publications. Authors “Kim J” published highest number of articles for the study period with 39 records, consecutive authors “Kim S” are published next highest number of articles for the study period with 20 records. “Muhammed K” having highest Global Citation Scores of 597 with just 12 publications followed by “Balsara PT” is having Global Citation Score of 256 with just 10 publications, while Kim S having lowest Global Citation Score of 48 with just 20 publications. Thus the most-cited authors are distinguished from the most-published ones. It is found from the analysis that Lotka’s law may not be applicable with regard to author productivity in proliferation of research in Digital Architecture as the research papers equally distributed by a large number of authors.



**Table – 6 Ranking of Authors Productivity based on Publications**

No	<u>Author</u>	No. of Articles	<u>TLCS</u>	<u>TGCS</u>
1	Kim J	<u>39</u>	69	588
2	Kim S	<u>20</u>	5	48
3	Lee J	<u>17</u>	7	55
4	Chandrakasan AP	<u>16</u>	55	500
5	Kim B	<u>16</u>	36	200
6	Lee H	<u>16</u>	3	93
7	Parhi KK	<u>16</u>	13	86
8	Staszewski RB	<u>16</u>	139	856
9	Rodriguez-Vazquez A	<u>15</u>	8	144
10	Meher PK	<u>14</u>	22	67
11	Moon UK	<u>14</u>	39	220
12	Varandas CAF	<u>14</u>	12	94
13	De Caro D	<u>13</u>	11	103
14	de la Rosa JM	<u>13</u>	3	76
15	Fontaine R	<u>13</u>	24	116
16	Lee S	<u>13</u>	5	77
17	Maloberti F	<u>13</u>	4	40
18	Roy K	<u>13</u>	5	130
19	Sousa J	<u>13</u>	12	92
20	Wang ZH	<u>13</u>	7	73
21	Gabrielli A	<u>12</u>	7	37
22	Geraci A	<u>12</u>	22	134
23	Lecomte R	<u>12</u>	23	112
24	Morie T	<u>12</u>	18	76
25	Muhammad K	<u>12</u>	104	597
26	Strollo AGM	<u>12</u>	11	102
27	Wang Y	<u>12</u>	6	416
28	Chen CY	<u>11</u>	2	35
29	Hu Y	<u>11</u>	5	289
30	Karim KS	<u>11</u>	21	143



#### 4.7 LOTKA'S LAW OF AUTHOR PRODUCTIVITY

Table-7 Showing Lotka's Law of Author Productivity

No. of Publication	Observer No. of Authors with n (an) or F	Observed % of authors 100 X an/ al	Expected No of Authors (an=al/n <sup>2</sup> ) (P)	Expected percentage of authors predicate by Lotka's 100/n <sup>2</sup>	(F-P) <sup>2</sup> /p
1	3100	100	3100	100	0
2	211	6.80	775	25	410.44
3	136	4.38	344.44	11.11	126.14
4	117	3.77	193.75	6.25	30.40
5	63	2.03	124	4	30.00
6	59	1.90	86.11	2.77	8.53
7	58	1.87	63.26	2.04	0.43
8	49	1.58	48.43	1.56	0.00
11	39	1.25	25.61	0.82	6.98
12	34	1.09	21.52	0.69	7.22
14	33	1.06	15.81	0.51	18.66
15	26	0.83	13.77	0.44	10.84
16	25	0.80	12.10	0.39	13.72
19	24	0.77	8.58	0.27	27.66
21	23	0.74	7.02	0.22	36.28
<b>Total</b>				<b>X<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>727.37</b>

The Lotka's law of author productivity is tested with the applications of scientific productivity Chi-square model, and it is applied in relation to number of authors contributing to the number of publications. Potter (1981) identified the Lotka's fraction  $1/na = 4.65$  on the basic of Euler – maclaurin formula of summation. This model is applied in the present study. The Chi-square can be computed as  $(f-p)^2/p$ , where  $f$  = observed number of authors with “n” publications;  $p$  = Expected number of authors. In this study, the productivity of Digital Architecture research scientists is examined. At the first observation, the analyzed data invalidate Lotka's findings that the proportion of all contributions that make a single contribution is less than 60 percent. Further, Lotka's Chi square model confirms the source trend. It explains the fact that the calculated  $x^2$  value is 727.32 which is less than the tabulated value at 5 percent level of significance.

#### 4.8 DOCUMENTATION OF WORD FREQUENCY IN THE PUBLICATIONS

Publications convey precisely the thought contents of the papers. The potency of information concentrated on the titles of the papers is more than the rest of the section of the papers. Therefore, if a word occurs more frequently than expected it to occur, then it reflects the emphasis given by the authors about the research field of their interest. The keywords analysis search was made in the web of science separately with all the keywords used in the search strategy in an interval of five years and for the year 2013 to obtain latest developments. The most commonly occurring keywords that appeared in the research articles presented in table-8 which depicts only those keywords which yielded five or more than five total publications. The high

frequency keywords were “DIGITAL” is topped with 1616 publications with the Global Citation Score of 14222, next “ARCHITECTURE” with the Global Citation Score of 6947 respectively. “BASED” has scored the highest Global Citation Score of 5367 with 835 publications.

**Table- 8 showing Word Frequency in the Publications**

No	Word	Recs	Percent	TLCS	TGCS
1	Digital	1616	25.5	1455	14222
2	Architecture	1017	16.1	663	6947
3	Based	835	13.2	411	5367
4	Design	560	8.8	252	3672
5	Using	548	8.7	350	4846
6	System	533	8.4	147	3173
7	High	390	6.2	284	3542
8	Cmos	376	5.9	483	4913
9	Power	366	5.8	264	2934
10	Low	361	5.7	312	3042
11	Time	361	5.7	369	2934
12	Implementation	292	4.6	138	1762
13	Systems	291	4.6	56	1776
14	Applications	264	4.2	136	2153
15	Delta	238	3.8	351	2113
16	Sigma	237	3.7	350	2111
17	Analysis	219	3.5	151	2608
18	Network	219	3.5	36	1374
19	Image	212	3.3	92	1737
20	Data	205	3.2	71	990
21	Efficient	205	3.2	99	1124
22	Processing	205	3.2	113	1538
23	Analog	204	3.2	251	2120
24	Signal	203	3.2	171	1654
25	Architectures	201	3.2	124	1453

#### 4.9 COUNTRYWISE RESEARCH OUTPUT

The study of country wise distribution of Digital Architecture research output is an important matter of subject discussion today. The publication of research output is a yardstick to observe the performance of a country in a particular discipline of Digital Architecture research. In this study, the research output in Digital Architecture is taken as a tool to evaluate its performance. It indicates all the themes distribution among the Countries. Only 9 (10.34%) are African continent, 31(35.63%) Countries are in Asian countries only 2(2.36%) Countries are in Oceania countries, 36(41.38%) Countries are in European Continent, 5(5.75%) country are in North America and 4(4.59%) countries are in South America. The research output of various countries from African continent are mentioned as below: South Africa occupies first place with 42.22 per cent, Tunisha second place with 22.22 per cent, Egypt third place with 15.55 per cent respectively.

The research output of various countries in Asian continent is mentioned as below: Japan (20.08) occupies first place among the thirty one countries. China (19.66%) occupies the second place and Taiwan (18.46) stands in the third place. From Oceania continents, only two countries

Australia and New Zealand are distributed in the research area and of Australia dominate the first place with 83.84 per cent.

European countries have been published research articles about all selected themes United Kingdom first place with 16.46 per cent, Italy second place with 17.37 per cent and the Spain third place 10.42 per cent respectively among the 36 countries. From the USA continent, only three countries have distributed to the research output. In this continent, Brazil with 67.82 per cent, Argentina second place with 21.73 per cent Chile occupy third places among the three countries.

It could be noted that the North European Countries (**40%**) have the highest place in research output on Digital Architecture. This continent has more than half of the output of research literature. The North American (**36.13%**) has taken the next place of North American continent. The Asian continents occupy the third place of the research output of Digital Architecture. Oceania Countries (2.05%) come next on the stage of the selected themes output on Digital Architecture.

## **5. MAJOR FINDINGS**

1. The finding of growth of publication of Digital Architecture research output brings out the highest percentage of papers were published in the year 2012, 2011 and 2009 constituting 9.39 % and 8.71% and 8.70% respectively. It shows that even minimum numbers of records were scored higher global citations. The study also reveals all these 6335 publications have 57883 cited references it shows that there is a healthy trend in citing reference is found among the Scientists belongs to digital architecture.
2. The findings of overall relative growth rate of literature in Digital Architecture in examine the following facts. Relative growth rate of publication has shown more or less a similar trend. Consequently the mean doubling time for publication of Digital Architecture has shown an increasing trend.
3. It is found that out of 6335 publications, articles from journals constitute 79.41 per cent, articles from conference proceedings constitute 17.99 percent of the total publications and 1.44 per cent, and followed by Book Review 0.35 per cent, and Book Chapter 0.15 percent respectively. In general, publications of journal article form have attracted a large number of Digital architecture scientists.
4. It is found that three author publications contribute 24.35%, it is followed by double author publication with 22.05 %, four authorship publications with 17.14%, single author research output with 10.53, five author publications with 10.34%, six authors 5.74% and above ten author research output with 3.39% respectively. From the result we come to know that the multi author publication is the highest compare to single author publication.
5. The find out author contribution “Kim J” published highest number of articles for the study period with 39 records, consecutive authors “Kim S” are published next highest number of articles for the study period with 20 records. “Muhammed K” having highest Global Citation Scores of 597 with just 12 publications followed by “Balsara PT” is having Global Citation Score of 256 with just 10 publications, while Kim S having lowest Global Citation Score of 48 with just 20 publications.
6. The findings of author productivity in terms of Lotka's law implications reveal the following facts that the analyzed data invalidate Lotka's findings. Lotka's Chi square model confirms the source trend. It explains the fact that the calculated  $\chi^2$  value is 727.32 which is less than the tabulated value at 5 percent level of significance.

7. The findings of degree of collaboration analysis reveal the following facts that the case of single author contributed papers is less. It brings out clearly the high level prevalence of collaborative research in digital architecture. Based on this study, the result of the degree of collaboration  $C=0.89$  i.e., 89 percent of collaboration authors articles published during the study periods.
8. The findings of high frequency keywords were “DIGITAL” is topped with 1616 publications with the Global Citation Score of 14222, next “ARCHITECTURE” with the Global Citation Score of 6947 respectively. “BASED” has scored the highest Global Citation Score of 5367 with 835 publications.
9. The findings a journal source wise research output performance in Digital Architecture point out the following facts. It is observed that among the 1497 journals only seven journals have hundred and more than hundred articles in Digital Architecture, those top are first journals is “IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits” second is “IEEE Transactions on Circuits And Systems I-Regular Papers” Third is “IEEE Transactions on Very Large Scale Integration (VLSI) Systems” and fourth is “IEEE Transactions on Consumer Electronics” respectively.
10. The findings of country wise analysis examine the following facts. The European Country top the list in using number cowards in the literature in Digital Architecture in bibliometric the North American countries the second, the Asia countries the third, the Oceania countries and the African countries the last respectively.

## REFERENCES

1. Srinivasa Ragavan,S.,Surulinathi,M.,Balasubramani,R and B. Neelakandan. “Mapping of Harvard Business Review Publications”. SMART Journal of Business Management Studies 6.1(2010):59-66
2. Gupta, B.M., HarKaur and AvinashKshitig. “Dementia research in India: A scientometric analysis of research output during 2002-11”, Annals of Library and Information Studies 59.4(2012):280-288.
3. Ranganathan, C“Scientometric Dimensions of Plastics Research Literature: A Global Perspective”. Paper presented at the UGC-SAP National seminar on “Scientometric and Informetrics”. Organized by Department of Library and Information Science, Annamalai University on 9- 10<sup>th</sup> March (2012):188-191
4. Ranganathan, C and Balasubramani,R “Mapping of Green Chemistry Research in India:A Scientometric Analysis” Journal of Advances in Library and Information Science 2.4(2013):221-229.
5. Balasubramani, R "Plasmodium Falciparum Research Publication in India: A Scientometric Analysis", European Journal of Scientific Research. 56.3(2011):294-300.
6. Surulinathi, M “An Evaluative study of Wi-Fi Communication Research Publications: A Scientometric Study”. SALIS Journal of Information Management Technology 1.1(2010):32-40.
7. Ranganathan, C and Balasubramani,R. Authorship Pattern of Digital Architecture Research Output: A Scientometric Analysis. International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology 2.12(2013):3615-3623.
8. Ranganathan, C and Balasubramani,R. Scientometric Profile of Research Activities on Green Energy: An Indian Perspective. IMPACT: International Journal of Research in Applied, Natural and Social Sciences 2.1(2014):23-30.