



## Crimson Canary Search Services

### Google Scholar vs. the Science Citation Index

Year of Paper	Science Citation Index		Google Scholar		Total Unique Citations
	# Citations	%	# Citations	%	
1999	2	50.00%	2	50.00%	4
2000	13	81.25%	13	81.25%	16
2002	7	100.00%	7	100.00%	7
2002	8	72.73%	10	90.91%	11
2003	9	81.82%	8	72.73%	11
2004	11	84.62%	13	100.00%	13
2004	9	75.00%	12	100.00%	12
2004	0	0.00%	3	100.00%	3
2005	1	100.00%	1	100.00%	1
2005	6	100.00%	3	50.00%	6
2005	19	95.00%	17	85.00%	20
2006	9	75.00%	9	75.00%	12
2006	6	60.00%	7	70.00%	10
2006	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	1
2007	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>78.91%</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>82.81%</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>Average</b>		<b>71.69%</b>		<b>78.33%</b>	

15 papers that were checked for citations using the [Science Citation Index](#) (Thomson Scientific) and [Google Scholar](#). The above table compares the results. As can be seen a greater, on average, number of citations were found using Google Scholar than using the Science Citation Index, although both services should be used if a comprehensive set of citations is needed.

It is fair to point out, however, that even that both services should not just be compared on numbers only – depending on what your need for citations are then one or the other may be a better option as a primary tool. The following table highlights some Pros and Cons of each system:

The Science Citation Index	Google Scholar
Costly	Free
Easy to output results	Difficult to output results
No Duplicates	Duplicates
Easy/Difficult depending on search interface used	Easy to search
Good coverage of older papers	Less good coverage of older papers

Here are a couple of similar articles which found similar results:

[Daniel Pauly, UBC](#)

[Maurella Della Seta, Istituto Superiore di Sanità](#)