

*promoting access to White Rose research papers*



**Universities of Leeds, Sheffield and York**  
**<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>**

---

This is an author produced version of a paper accepted for publication in **Aslib Proceedings: New Information Perspectives**.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/3559/>

---

**Published paper**

Willett, P. (2007) *A bibliometric analysis of the literature of chemoinformatics*.  
Aslib Proceedings: New Information Perspectives . ISSN 0001-253X (In Press)

---

# A Bibliometric Analysis of the Literature of Chemoinformatics

Peter Willett<sup>1</sup>, Krebs Institute for Biomolecular Research and Department of Information Studies, University of Sheffield, UK

## Structured Abstract.

**Purpose:** To analyse the literature of chemoinformatics, a subject that has arisen over the last few years and that draws on techniques from a range of disciplines, most notably chemistry (particularly computational and medicinal chemistry), computer science and information science.

**Method:** Subject, author and citation searches of (principally) the *Web of Knowledge* database.

**Findings:** The *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* (previously the *Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences*) is the core journal for the subject, but with many significant papers being published in journals whose principal focus is molecular modelling, quantitative structure-activity relationships or more general aspects of chemistry. The discipline is international in scope, and many of the most cited papers describe software packages that play a key role in modern chemoinformatics research

**Originality:** This is the first bibliometric study of chemoinformatics, and one of only a very few that consider the bibliometrics of computational chemistry more generally.

## Paper Type

Research paper

## Keywords

Author productivity, Bibliometrics, cheminformatics, chemoinformatics, citation analysis

## INTRODUCTION

Chemical information has been processed and exploited for many years, first in printed (Cooke, 2004) and then in computer form (Gasteiger 2003; Hann and Green 1999). It is now, under the name of *chemoinformatics*, a key component of modern chemical research (Gasteiger and Engels, 2003; Leach and Gillet, 2003). Chemoinformatics' enhanced role has come about principally from the vast increase that has occurred in the volumes of data that need to be stored, searched and mined in research programmes for the discovery of biologically active molecules, most obviously but not exclusively in the pharmaceutical and agrochemical industries. These programmes involve the synthesis of large numbers of chemical compounds, followed by testing to identify those (normally very few) molecules that exhibit the biological activity of interest, e.g., lowering a person's blood pressure. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Address: Department of Information Studies, University of Sheffield, 211 Portobello Street, Sheffield S1 4DP, UK; Telephone: 0044-114-2222633; Email: p.willett@sheffield.ac.uk

explosion in research data has been occasioned by technological developments that have enabled both chemical synthesis and biological testing to move from an inherently sequential to a massively parallel mode of processing: *combinatorial synthesis* enables large numbers – hundreds or even thousands – of structurally related molecules to be synthesised simultaneously, and *high-throughput screening* (HTS) enables these molecules to undergo testing for (normally) *in vitro* biological activity simultaneously.

The first formal definition of chemoinformatics was that of Brown (1998) who stated that “The use of information technology and management has become a critical part of the drug discovery process. Chemoinformatics is the mixing of those information resources to transform data into information and information into knowledge for the intended purpose of making better decisions faster in the area of drug lead identification and optimization”, a definition that ties the subject very closely to the pharmaceutical industry where many of the key developments have taken place. A more general definition is that of Paris, as cited by Warr (1999): “Chem(o)informatics is a generic term that encompasses the design, creation, organization, management, retrieval, analysis, dissemination, visualization and use of chemical information”. Most recently, Gasteiger (2006) has referred to it as “the application of informatics methods to the solution of chemical problems”.

In this paper, we shall take 1998 as the starting point for our analysis, as this was when Brown’s first formal definition of chemoinformatics appeared. That said, many of the basic techniques in chemoinformatics were developed prior to that date; indeed, the title of the paper by Hann and Green (1999) is “Chemoinformatics - a new name for an old problem”. The 1998 starting point is thus rather arbitrary in nature and the interested reader is referred to several accounts (Chen 2006; Engel 2006; Willett 2003) that describe the historical development of the subject and of its core technologies, e.g., the use of graph, statistical and expert-system methods for searching chemical structure databases, for predicting biological activity, and designing synthetic pathways, respectively.

Bibliometrics involves the quantitative analysis of the literature of a subject domain, as represented by bibliographic entities such as keywords, classification codes, authors and citations. The newness of chemoinformatics – it is only recently that the first textbooks (Gasteiger and Engels, 2003; Leach and Gillet, 2003) and the first academic specialist courses (Wild and Wiggins, 2006) have appeared - means that there have been very few bibliometric analyses to date. Indeed, the only detailed study is that of Onodera (2001), which commenced with an analysis of the papers chosen for abstracting in subsection 20-5 of the *Chemical Abstracts* database. This subsection is entitled “Chemical information, documentation and

data processing” and Onodera showed that the *Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences* was by far the most frequently occurring journal in this subsection during the period 1972-2000 (i.e., mostly prior to the recognition of chemoinformatics as a distinct discipline). Onodera then analysed the indexing terms assigned to articles appearing in this core journal and demonstrated that there had been noticeable changes in content over the years, with the initial focus on information science and computer applications – particularly techniques for representing and searching databases of chemical structures – being broadened to encompass topics such as property prediction, simulation and modelling (which were referred to as the molecular information sciences). The change in focus has been reflected in changes in the name of the journal: it started life as the *Journal of Chemical Documentation* (1961-1974), then became the *Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences* (1975-2004) and took its current title of the *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* as recently as 2005; in what follows, we shall refer to this journal as *JCICS*, irrespective of the precise date of publication that is being considered. The move from traditional chemical information science to the broader molecular information sciences was also noted in a subsequent paper by Onodera (2003) that analysed the papers presented over 25 years at the Japanese “Symposia on Chemical Information and Computer Science”; this paper also considered the distribution of author affiliations and the relative importance of academic and of industrial contributions to the symposia. Finally, the most important papers in *JCICS*, defined as those attracting at least 100 citations since 1997, are briefly discussed in a review by Warr (2005) of the historical development of the field.

### JOURNAL COVERAGE OF CHEMOINFORMATICS

The very recent appearance of chemoinformatics as a distinct discipline is clearly indicated by the fact that there is still some disagreement as to its name, with two closely related names being used to describe the field: cheminformatics and chemoinformatics (and a third, chemiinformatics, that is arguably more correct from a linguistic point but far less mellifluous when spoken). A constantly updated analysis of Google postings (at URL <http://www.molinspiration.com/chemoinformatics.html>) suggests that cheminformatics is used noticeably more frequently than chemoinformatics. Table 1 lists the postings frequencies for searches<sup>2</sup> for the three chem?informatics variants and for four related phrases that occur in the literature; these searches involved *Google*, *Google Scholar*, the *Web of Knowledge (WOK)* and *Scopus*. In this table the *Google* occurrence-frequencies are all described by the database as “about”, the *WOK* occurrences are based on the title, keywords and abstract for each document in the *Science Citation Index*, the *Social Science Citation*

---

<sup>2</sup> All the database searches in this paper were carried out in December 2006 and January 2007.

*Index* and the *Arts and Humanities Citation Index*, and the Scopus occurrences are based on all fields; the *Google Scholar*, *WOK* and *Scopus* occurrences are from 1998 onwards. Of the three cheminformatics variants, cheminformatics is clearly the most used in common parlance, but chemoinformatics would appear to be the most used in the academic literature: in this respect, <http://www.amazon.com> lists six books with chemoinformatics in the title (Bajorath, 2004; Gasteiger, 2003; Gasteiger and Engel, 2003; Lavine, 2005; Leach and Gillet, 2003; Oprea 2005), as against just one with cheminformatics (Noordik, 2004); there is also one entitled *Chemical Information Management* (Suhr and Warr, 1992). We shall generally use chemoinformatics in this paper.

Articles on chemoinformatics may not, of course, contain that particular word (or a variant); but articles that do contain it may be assumed (with a fair degree of probability) to contain material about that subject. Journals that publish relevant material were hence sought using the query

chemoinformatics OR cheminformatics OR “chemical informatics”,

the three most common search terms in academic usage in Table 1. This search of the title, keyword and abstract fields retrieved 197 post-1997 documents in the *WOK* database, with 13 literature sources yielding a minimum of three documents as shown in Table 2. Of these documents, the majority were journal articles with meeting abstracts the next most-common document type. With the exception of the top-ranked entry, which refers to papers presented at the twice-yearly national conferences of the American Chemical Society, it will be seen that the list is dominated by *JCICS*, hence confirming that it is the core journal for the subject. That apart the list contains several broadly-based chemical journals (*Drug Discovery Today*, *Current Opinion in Drug Discovery and Development*, *Chimia*, *Indian Journal of Chemistry Section A*, and *Molecules*), with the remainder being specialist journals covering topics that are very closely related to chemoinformatics such as bioinformatics, HTS and molecular diversity analysis, molecular modelling and quantitative structure-activity relationships (QSAR). These closely related subjects often appear in *JCICS*: for example, its 412 documents make it the largest single source represented in the 4746 documents retrieved in a *WOK* search for

QSAR OR “quantitative structure-activity relationship\*”,

ranking it higher than the specialist journals in the field, i.e., *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design*; *Journal of Medicinal Chemistry*, *Journal of Molecular Graphics and Modelling* and *QSAR & Combinatorial Science* (previously entitled *Quantitative Structure-Activity Relationships*). In like manner, *JCICS*’ 49 documents make it the largest source represented in the 1308 citations retrieved in a *WOK* search for

“molecular diversity”,

with the other high-ranked journals here being from the fields of biology and genetics (where “diversity” has a rather different meaning). It is this increased scope (going beyond the traditional focus on chemical database searching noted by Onodera (2001)), that seems to have triggered the recent change of name from *Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences* to *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* (Jorgensen, 2005).

It is clear that chemoinformatics (in its various linguistic forms) is perceived to be rather different from chemical information, since the addition of

OR “chemical information”

to the WOK query in Table 2 yielded 1024 documents in a wide range of journals. Thus, the top three sources in Table 2 were joined at the head of the ranked list by physical and analytical chemistry journals (*Analytical Chemistry*, *Analytica Chimica Acta*, *Applied Surface Science* and *Applied Spectroscopy*), and large numbers of more general chemical journals appeared high in the rankings (e.g., *Journal of Chemical Education*, *Analyst*, *Journal of Chromatography A*, and *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*). None of these are journals that researchers in chemoinformatics would regard as key sources for their discipline.

An alternative approach to the analysis of the core journals in a discipline has been described recently by Leydesdorff (2007). Drawing on an extensive analysis of WOK data, he has made available for each of over 7000 journals those journals that were responsible in 2003-04 for at least 1% of the citations to a given journal. There are 15 such journals in the case of *JCICS*, these including *Combinatorial Chemistry and High Throughput Screening*, *Current Opinion in Drug Discovery and Development*, *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design*, and *QSAR & Combinatorial Science* (and, of course, *JCICS* itself) from Table 2, and *Journal of Molecular Graphics and Modelling* and *SAR and QSAR in Environmental Research* from amongst those listed in Table 3 (as discussed in the next section).

Leydesdorff also provides comparable data for those journals providing at least 1% of the citations from (rather than to) a chosen journal. In the case of *JCICS* there are just five such journals (apart from *JCICS* itself), of which there is one - *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design* - from amongst those in Tables 2 and 3. The much smaller number of “citations from”, as against “citations to” journals shows that *JCICS* papers cite a range of journals, rather than focusing on just a small number covering the same subject domain. This may be due to the fact that chemoinformatics is still emerging as a topic in its own right and that it is inherently multi-disciplinary in nature, drawing on work in both more general subjects (chemistry, computing, and library and information science) and more specific

subjects (databases, medicinal chemistry, molecular modelling, QSAR etc.), which would imply that only a few journals would meet the 1% criterion. Journal data for citations to or from *JCICS* for the period 1981-1998 (i.e., before the emergence of chemoinformatics as a distinct discipline) are provided by Onodera (2001).

Bibliometric studies have traditionally used the *WOK* databases to obtain productivity and citation data, but the last few years have seen the introduction of several new sources of bibliometric information, most importantly the *Google Scholar* and *Scopus* databases. The relative merits of the various resources are being increasingly discussed (Jacso, 2005; Meho and Yang, 2007), and it has been suggested that multiple data sources need to be used if comprehensive statistics are to be obtained. In what follows, we have used just *WOK* data, but would not expect radically different conclusions were other sources to be used: for example, carrying out the search in Table 2 on *Scopus* gave a list of the 13 top-ranked journals that was headed by *JCICS* (the *Abstracts of papers of the American Chemical Society* does not appear in the *Scopus* database) and also contained *Combinatorial Chemistry and High-Throughput Screening*, *Current Opinion in Drug Discovery and Development*, *Drug Discovery Today*, *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design*, *Molecular Diversity*, *Molecules* and *QSAR & Combinatorial Science*.

#### AUTHOR PRODUCTIVITY

The journals in Table 2 are those that have made most use of the term “chemoinformatics” (and its variants) and can hence be considered as having this topic as a focus of interest. However, an author analysis suggests that whilst researchers in bioinformatics and HTS (as exemplified by the journals *Bioinformatics*, *Combinatorial Chemistry and High-Throughput Screening*, and *Journal of Biomolecular Screening*) are aware of the importance of chemoinformatics, the most productive researchers do not publish frequently in the core chemoinformatics journals. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 3, which summarises the outputs of *WOK* searches for 1998-2006 carried out on the specialist journals from Table 2 (i.e., *Bioinformatics*, *Combinatorial Chemistry and High-Throughput Screening*, *JCICS*, *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design*, *Molecular Diversity* and *Quantitative Structure-Activity Relationships/QSAR & Combinatorial Science*) and on the three further specialist journals listed in the right-hand columns of the table (all of which carry articles on chemoinformatics but insufficient to appear in the top-ranked journals in Table 2). These are: *SAR and QSAR in Environmental Research*, which covers QSAR-related topics analogous to those published in *QSAR & Combinatorial Science*; and *Journal of Molecular Graphics and Modelling* and *Journal of Molecular Modeling*, which are, with *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design*, the leading journals for the modelling of small chemical molecules (as

against the modelling of biological macromolecules, which are covered in journals such as *Journal of Molecular Biology*, *Nucleic Acids Research* and *Proteins*).

For each journal in Table 3, we have listed the 20 most productive authors in this period, using the Analyse Results and Citation Reports routines in *WOK*; similar, but more extended, facilities are available in the *HISTCITE* system (Garfield and Pudovkin, 2004). The reader should note that the use of a fixed cut-off (both here and elsewhere in the paper) means that there may well be other authors who published as many papers in a particular journal as the 20<sup>th</sup>-ranked author for that journal. Each column in the table represents one journal, with the number of papers published in the journal during 1998-2006 in brackets after the journal's name; each of the 20 elements of the column then contains an author name and the number of papers (bracketed) published in that journal during that period by that author. Authors appearing in more than one column, i.e., individuals who are productive in multiple journals, are listed in boldface italics.

Inspection of the extent to which individual authors publish across the range of journals listed here shows that none of the highly productive researchers in bioinformatics or HTS publish to any great extent in the chemoinformatics, molecular modelling and QSAR literatures (as represented by the other specialist journals in Table 2); this comment applies to a lesser extent to *Molecular Diversity*, where the majority of the articles deal with combinatorial synthesis rather than the computational aspects of molecular diversity analysis. There is, however, a considerable degree of overlap between the other journals, and this is further emphasised if we include the three further specialist publications in the three right-hand columns of the table. Two of the authors in Table 3, Bajorath and Fan, publish extensively in four of the journals here; Willett publishes extensively in three; and there are twelve (Agrafiotis, Basak, Carbo-Dorca, Clark RD and Clark T, Cronin, Dearden, Doucet, Gasteiger, Gillet, Mekenyan and Randic) who publish extensively in two of the journals. There is some degree of correlation between these highly productive authors: *QSAR & Combinatorial Science* and *SAR and QSAR in Environmental Science* share five highly productive authors, as do *JCICS* and *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design*. The first pairing is hardly surprising given the titles and content of these two QSAR journals; the second pairing reflects the fact that *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design*, one of the leading molecular modelling journals, publishes a fair number of database-related papers. *JCICS* has the greatest number (eight) of productive authors who are also productive authors in other journals, which again reflects the key role that this journal plays in chemoinformatics and its multi-disciplinary nature.

## THE CORE LITERATURE

One of the many uses of bibliometrics is the identification of the key publications in the development of a discipline, where the importance of a publication is assumed to be approximated by the number of citations to it, and we have hence sought the most cited papers in the core journal of *JCICS* (see also Warr (2005)) and in the associated specialist journals in the six right-hand columns of Table 3. Searches were carried out for all documents in the chosen journals for the period 1998-2006, and the 4411 resulting documents (of which over 90% were articles) then ranked in decreasing order of the number of citations.

The 4411 documents attracted a total of 35,228 citations, with the 20 most highly cited documents (all articles) listed in Table 4: many of these articles will be familiar to workers in the field of chemoinformatics, whatever their particular specialism. A characteristic of chemoinformatics is the widespread use of certain software packages (often available via specialist software companies such as Accelrys Inc. or Tripos Inc., *inter alia*) for, e.g., displaying molecules or searching databases. This has the result that many of the articles listed in Table 4 are the “standard” references that are cited whenever anybody subsequently uses these packages: such articles are denoted in the table by “(S)” after the citation count. Obvious examples are GROMACS and MOLDOEN (the two top papers in Table 4), DOCK and XCrystDen, as well as two others in the table where this is not obvious from the title of the paper: those by Pearlman and Smith and by Clark *et al.* describe the Diviner Solutions and CSDcore software packages, respectively. Indeed, the two most cited articles in the history of *JCICS* (Warr, 2005) come into this category, these being the standard references for the database searching systems used by the Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre (Allen *et al.*, 1991) and by the Daresbury Chemical Database Service (Fletcher *et al.*, 1996); both of these pre-date our 1998 starting point and are not included in Table 4 only because they have insufficient citations in the period 1998-2006. Review articles - denoted by “(R)” in Table 4 - often attract large numbers of citations, e.g., from the introductory sections of subsequent papers, and there are two reviews here – those by Willett *et al.* (1998) and by Taylor *et al.* (2002). Of the remaining 12 articles in the table, no less than four discuss the characteristics that differentiate drugs from other, non-drug molecules (Oprea *et al.*, 2001; Hann *et al.*, 2000; Oprea, 2000; Gillet *et al.*, 1998), and there are two on the calculation of binding energies (i.e., the strength with which a drug molecule attaches itself to a biological receptor) (Bohm, 1998; Wang *et al.*, 2002). The trends noted here continue if one goes further down the list of highly-cited documents, with the next ten rank positions containing two further reviews, three further software descriptions, and two further articles on the calculation of binding energies.

Onodera (2001) noted that a large fraction of *JCICS* articles originated from outside of the USA, this fraction being greater than for any of the other journals published by the American Chemical Society, the world's largest publisher of chemical literature. This observation applies to the field of chemoinformatics more generally. Table 5 lists the geographical data for the ten most productive countries in the 1997-98 issues of *JCICS* (Onodera, 2001) and in the set of 4411 chemoinformatics documents described above. The USA provided 34.1% of the latter set of documents, but there were another 16 countries that provided at least 2% of those for which Country/Territory data are available in the *WOK* database. Note that Table 5 does not contain an entry for the United Kingdom as such, since England, Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales are entered separately in *WOK*; note also the perhaps surprisingly high *JCICS* rankings for Romania and Croatia, both of which have productive groups working in a very specific area of QSAR and publishing much of their research in this journal. The most obvious difference between the two parts of the table is the emergence of the People's Republic of China and India, both of which now compete strongly with the traditionally productive European research groups. For comparison with Onodera's figures, the table also contains data for the papers published in *JCICS* in 2006, which further demonstrate the broad spread of chemoinformatics research.

Finally, Table 6 lists the most productive institutions in the set of 4411 documents, this table reflecting many of the key research groups in chemoinformatics (e.g., those at the Universities of Erlangen-Nurnberg, Sheffield and Cambridge) and modelling or QSAR (e.g., the Environmental Protection Agency, the University of Minnesota, Liverpool John Moores University and Pennsylvania State University). The most productive here is the National Institute of Chemistry in Ljubljana, Slovenia, which has conducted extensive research in various aspects of QSAR. All but two of the top 50 institutions are universities, governmental or not-for-profit organisations with just two – Tripos, one of the major chemoinformatics software companies, at rank-position 27 and Pfizer, the world's largest pharmaceutical research firm, at rank-position 36. Commercial organisations do not normally figure in listings such as these, since they are focused on producing some commercial product rather than academic knowledge; the fact that two such organisations do appear here reflects the fact that much of the leading-edge research in chemoinformatics is carried out in industry, principally by software companies that are developing chemoinformatics packages and by pharmaceutical companies who purchase and use these packages or develop their own in-house.

## CONCLUSIONS

Chemoinformatics first appeared as a distinct discipline in the late-Nineties, since when it has generated a considerable literature. Analysis of data from, principally, the *Web of Knowledge* database shows that the *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* (previously the *Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences*) is the core journal for the subject, but with many significant papers being published in journals whose principal focus is molecular modelling or QSAR, or more general aspects of chemistry. This paper highlights the most productive authors and institutions, noting the international nature of the discipline, and the most cited papers, many of which describe software packages that play a key role in modern chemoinformatics research.

**Acknowledgements.** My thanks to Dr Val Gillet, Dr Alex Tropsha and Dr Wendy Warr for comments on this paper, and to Chemical Abstracts Service for providing the country-of-origin data for papers in the 2006 issues of *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, F.H. et al. (1991), "The development of Versions 3 and 4 of the Cambridge Structural Database System", *Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences*, Vol. 31, pp. 187-204.
- Bajorath, J., Ed. (2004), *Chemoinformatics. Concepts, Methods and Tools for Drug Discovery*, Humana Press, Totowa NJ.
- Brown, F.K. (1998). "Chemoinformatics: what is it and how does it impact drug discovery?", *Annual Reports in Medicinal Chemistry*, Vol. 33, pp. 375-384.
- Chen, W.L. (2006). "Chemoinformatics: past, present and future", *Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences*, Vol. 46, pp. 2230-2255.
- Cooke, H. (2004), "A historical study of structures for communication of organic chemistry information prior to 1950", *Organic and Biomolecular Chemistry*, Vol. 2, pp. 3179-3191.
- Engel, T. (2006), "Basic overview of chemoinformatics", *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, Vol. 46, pp. 2267-2277.
- Fletcher, D.A. et al. (1996), "The United Kingdom Chemical Database Service", *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, Vol. 36, pp. 746-749.
- Garfield, E., Pudovkin, A.I. (2004), Paper presented at the Annual ASIS&T Meeting. Newport, RI (available at <http://www.garfield.library.upenn.edu/papers/asistposter2004.pdf>).
- Gasteiger, J., Ed. (2003), *Handbook of Chemoinformatics*, Wiley-VCH, Weinheim.
- Gasteiger, J. (2006), "The central role of chemoinformatics", *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems*, Vol. 82, pp. 200-209.
- Gasteiger, J., Engel, T., Eds. (2003). *Chemoinformatics: A Textbook*, Wiley-VCH, Weinheim.
- Hann, M., Green, R. (1999). "Chemoinformatics - a new name for an old problem?", *Current Opinion in Chemical Biology*, Vol. 3, pp. 379-383.
- Jacso, P. (2005). "As we may search - comparison of major features of the Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar citation-based and citation-enhanced databases", *Current Science*, Vol. 89, pp. 1537-1547.
- Jorgensen, W.L. (2005), "Editorial", *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, Vol. 45, pp. 1.
- Lavine, B.K., Ed. (2005), *Chemometrics and Chemoinformatics*, American Chemical Society, Washington DC.
- Leach, A.R., Gillet, V.J. (2003), *An Introduction to Chemoinformatics*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Leydesdorff, L. (2007), "Visualization of the citation impact environment of scientific journals: An online mapping exercise", *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 58, pp. 25-38.

- Meho, L., Yang, K. (2007), "A new era in citation and bibliometric analyses: Web of Science, Scopus and Google Scholar", *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, in press.
- Noordik, J.H., Ed. (2004), *Cheminformatics Developments: History, Reviews and Current Research*, IOS Press, Amsterdam.
- Onodera, N. (2001), "A bibliometric study on chemical information and computer sciences focusing on literature of JCICS", *Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences*, Vol. 41, pp. 878-888.
- Onodera, N. (2003), "Research trends of chemical information and computer sciences in Japan observed from the publications at the "Symposia on Chemical Information and Computer Science": a bibliometric analysis of the subjects and the authors' affiliated institutions", *Journal of Computer-Aided Chemistry*, Vol. 4, pp. 1-17.
- Oprea, T.I., Ed. (2005), *Cheminformatics in Drug Discovery*, Wiley-VCH, Weinheim.
- Suhr, C., Warr, W.A. (1992), *Chemical Information Management*, Wiley-VCH, Weinheim.
- Warr, W. A. (1999), Paper presented at the *218th American Chemical Society National Meeting*, New Orleans, USA.
- Warr, W. A. (2005), Paper presented at the *229th American Chemical Society National Meeting*, San Diego, USA (available at <http://www.warr.com/25years.html>)
- Wild, D.J., Wiggins, G.D. (2006), "Challenges for chemoinformatics education in drug discovery", *Drug Discovery Today*, Vol. 11, pp. 436-439.
- Willett, P. (2003), "A history of chemoinformatics", in Gasteiger, J. Ed. *Handbook of Chemoinformatics*, Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, pp. 6-20.

Term	Google	Google Scholar	Web of Knowledge	Scopus
Chemical documentation	695,000	66	1	34
Chemical informatics	50,400	129	20	39
Chemical information management	978	42	4	28
Chemical information science	779	17	2	5
Chemiinformatics	2,230	2	2	2
Cheminformatics	320,000	447	83	250
Chemoinformatics	191,000	5636	99	473

Table 1. Occurrences of search terms in *Google*, *Google Scholar*, the *Web of Knowledge* and *Scopus*

Citation source	Number of documents
<i>Abstracts of papers of the American Chemical Society</i>	44
<i>Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences/Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling</i>	22
<i>Drug Discovery Today</i>	11
<i>Combinatorial Chemistry and High-Throughput Screening</i>	5
<i>Bioinformatics</i>	4
<i>Current Opinion in Drug Discovery and Development</i>	4
<i>Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design</i>	4
<i>Molecular Diversity</i>	4
<i>Quantitative Structure-Activity Relationships/QSAR &amp; Combinatorial Science</i>	4
<i>Chimia</i>	3
<i>Indian Journal of Chemistry Section A</i>	3
<i>Journal of Biomolecular Screening</i>	3
<i>Molecules</i>	3

Table 2. Most frequently occurring literature sources in a search of the *Web of Knowledge* for cheminformatics, chemoinformatics or chemical informatics

<i>Bioinformatics</i> (3492)	<i>Combinatorial Chemistry and High-Throughput Screening</i> (532)	<i>Journal of Biomolecular Screening</i> (542)	<i>Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences/Modeling</i> (1903)	<i>Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design</i> (530)	<i>Molecular Diversity</i> (122)	<i>Quantitative Structure-Activity Relationships/QSAR and Combinatorial Science</i> (496)	<i>Journal of Molecular Graphics and Modelling</i> (582)	<i>Journal of Molecular Modeling</i> (550)	<i>SAR and QSAR in Environmental Research</i> (328)
Valencia, A. (27)	Crameri, R. (8)	Burns, D.J. (15)	<b>Randic, M. (38)</b>	<b>Willett, P. (9)</b>	Jung, G. (4)	Walker, J.D. (13)	Boyd, D.B. (12)	<b>Clark, T. (17)</b>	Devillers, J. (23)
Apweiler, R. (23)	Zucht, H.D. (8)	Warrior, U. (14)	<b>Willett, P. (33)</b>	Holtje, H.D. (8)	Yavari, I. (4)	<b>Cronin, M.T.D. (11)</b>	Goodsell, D.S. (10)	Capkova, P. (12)	<b>Cronin, M.T.D. (15)</b>
Dougherty, E.R. (22)	Schulz-Knappe, P. (7)	Pope, A.J. (12)	<b>Basak, S.C. (32)</b>	Liljefors, T. (7)	Dolle, R.E. (3)	Schneider, G. (11)	<b>Willett, P. (10)</b>	Forner, W. (11)	Schultz, T.W. (15)
Lengauer, T. (22)	Tammen, H. (7)	Oldenburg, K.R. (8)	Jurs, P.C. (32)	Filizola, M. (6)	Kim, S.W. (3)	<b>Fan, B.T. (10)</b>	<b>Bajorath, J. (9)</b>	Badawi, H.M. (10)	<b>Basak, S.C. (14)</b>
Baldi, P. (17)	Van Breemen, R.B. (7)	Sills, M.A. (7)	Katritzky, A.R. (30)	Oprea, T.I. (6)	Xu, J. (3)	Meldal, M. (10)	Gaber, B.P. (8)	Guseinov, I. (8)	<b>Fan, B.T. (11)</b>
Bork, P. (17)	Hess, R. (6)	Chung, T.D.Y. (6)	<b>Bajorath, J. (28)</b>	<b>Carbo-Dorca, R. (5)</b>	Afantitis, A. (2)	Roy, K. (10)	Griffith, R. (8)	Aviyente, V. (7)	<b>Dearden, J.C. (10)</b>
Vingron, M. (17)	Kellmann, M. (6)	Sewing, A. (6)	Karelson, M. (25)	Carotti, A. (5)	<b>Agrafiotis, D.K. (2)</b>	Schaper, K.J. (10)	Hubbard, R.E. (6)	Lai, L.H. (7)	<b>Mekenyan, O. (10)</b>
Kim, S. (14)	Actor, J.K. (5)	Willey, M.J. (6)	<b>Carbo-Dorca, R. (21)</b>	<b>Clark, R.D. (5)</b>	Akerblom, E.B. (2)	Raevsky, O.A. (8)	Martin, N.H. (6)	Zakarya, D. (7)	<b>Doucet, J.P. (8)</b>
Ouzounis, C.A. (14)	Kyle, D.J. (5)	Arnold, F.H. (5)	Balaban, A.T. (20)	Dean, P.M. (5)	Andersson, PL (2)	Schuurmann, G. (8)	Welsh, W.J. (6)	<b>Bajorath, J. (6)</b>	Panaye, A. (8)
Stormo, G.D. (14)	Yao, S.Q. (5)	Ashman, S. (5)	Godden, J.W. (20)	<b>Fan, B.T. (5)</b>	<b>Bajorath, J. (2)</b>	Wiese, M. (8)	<b>Agrafiotis, D.K. (5)</b>	Jiao, H.J. (6)	Worth, A.P. (8)

Xu, Y. (14)	Appel, A. (4)	Banks, P. (5)	Gutman, I. (17)	<b><i>Gasteiger, J.</i></b> (5)	Baxter, A.D. (2)	Alberico, F. (7)	Chatterjee, A. (5)	Brickmann, J. (5)	Cunningham, A.R. (7)
Mewes, H.W. (13)	Bazylak, G. (4)	Beutel, B.A. (5)	Trinajstic, N. (17)	Karplus, M. (5)	Eriksson, L. (2)	Darvas, F. (6)	<b><i>Clark, R.D.</i></b> (5)	Hou, T.J. (5)	Dimitrov, S (7)
Noble, W.S. (13)	Heilker, R. (4)	Eglen, R.M. (5)	<b><i>Fan, B.T.</i></b> (16)	Ramos, M.J. (5)	Houghten, R.A. (2)	<b><i>Mekenyan, O.</i></b> (6)	<b><i>Clark, T.</i></b> (5)	Lanig, H. (5)	Gute, B.D. (7)
Zimmer, R. (13)	Hindsgaul, O. (4)	Fox, S. (5)	Xue, L. (16)	Sanz, F. (5)	Igglessi-Markopoulou, O. (2)	Vedani, A. (6)	Flower, D.R. (5)	Murray, J.S. (5)	Mills, D. (7)
Bateman, A. (12)	Jolley, M.E. (4)	Gribbon, P. (5)	Estrada, E. (15)	Verdonk, M.L. (5)	Jacchieri, S.G. (2)	Breton, R. (5)	Maigret, B. (5)	Selcuki, C. (5)	Netzeva, T.I. (7)
Bruniak S. (12)	Kassel, D.B. (4)	Kariv, I. (5)	<b><i>Gasteiger, J.</i></b> (15)	Carrieri, A. (4)	Johansson, E. (2)	Carreira, L.A. (5)	Reynolds, C.H. (5)	Wang, R.X. (5)	<b><i>Randic, M.</i></b> (7)
Kolchanov, N.A. (12)	Kay, B.K. (4)	Kofron, J.L. (5)	Rucker, C. (15)	Centeno, N.B. (4)	Koh, J.S. (2)	<b><i>Dearden, J.C.</i></b> (5)	Schulten, K. (5)	Weiss, Z. (5)	Rosenkranz, H.S. (7)
Sander, C. (12)	Kumar, A. (4)	Moore, K.J. (5)	Tropsha, A. (15)	Cruciani, G. (4)	Lee, E.J. (2)	Dorman, G. (5)	Waldman, M. (5)	Wu, G. (5)	Carlsen, L. (6)
Brass, A. (11)	Lehrach, H. (4)	Parker, C.N. (5)	<b><i>Gillet, V.J.</i></b> (14)	Gago, F. (4)	Melagraki, G. (2)	<b><i>Doucet, J.P.</i></b> (5)	Winkler, D.A. (5)	Xu, X.J. (5)	Carpy, A.J.M. (6)
Gerstein M. (11)	Mitscher, L.A. (4)	Prossnitz, E.R. (5)	Gomez-Nieto, M.A. (14)	<b><i>Gillet, V.J.</i></b> (4)	Perez-Paya, E. (2)	Fernandez-Fornier, D. (5)	Burton, N.A. (4)	Yan, S.M. (5)	Marchand-Geneste, N. (6)

Table 3. Most productive authors in the ten specialist journals identified in Table 2. The bracketed number following each journal (or author) name is the number of documents published in that journal in the period 1998-2006. Italicised, boldface authors appear in more than one column of the table.

Highly cited article	Citations
Lindahl, E. <i>et al.</i> (2001), "GROMACS 3.0: a package for molecular simulation and trajectory analysis", <i>Journal of Molecular Modeling</i> , Vol. 7, pp. 306-317.	854 (S)
Schaftenaar, G., Noordik, J.H. (2000), "Molden: a pre- and post-processing program for molecular and electronic structures", <i>Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design</i> , Vol. 14, pp. 123-134.	701 (S)
Willett, P. <i>et al.</i> (1998), "Chemical similarity searching", <i>Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences</i> , Vol. 38, pp. 983-996.	291(R)
Dunker, A.K. <i>et al.</i> (2001), "Intrinsically disordered protein", <i>Journal of Molecular Graphics and Modelling</i> , Vol. 19, pp. 26-59.	239
Ewing, T.J.A. <i>et al.</i> (2001), "DOCK 4.0: search strategies for automated molecular docking of flexible molecule databases", <i>Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design</i> , Vol. 15, pp. 411-428.	181 (S)
Golbraikh, A., Tropsha, A. (2002), "Beware of q <sup>2</sup> !", <i>Journal of Molecular Graphics and Modelling</i> , Vol. 20, pp. 269-276.	167
Wessel, M.D. <i>et al.</i> (1998), "Prediction of human intestinal absorption of drug compounds from molecular structure", <i>Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences</i> , Vol. 38, pp. 726-735.	157
Oprea, T.I. <i>et al.</i> (2001), "Is there a difference between leads and drugs? A historical perspective", <i>Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences</i> , Vol. 41, pp. 1308-1315.	145
Bohm, H.-J. (1998), "Prediction of binding constants of protein ligands: A fast method for the prioritization of hits obtained from de novo design or 3D database search programs", <i>Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design</i> , Vol. 12, pp. 309-323.	143 (S)
Platts, J.A. <i>et al.</i> (1999), "Estimation of molecular linear free energy relation descriptors using a group contribution approach", <i>Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences</i> , Vol. 39, pp. 835-845.	137
Hann, M.M. <i>et al.</i> (2001), "Molecular complexity and its impact on the probability of finding leads for drug discovery", <i>Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences</i> , Vol. 41, pp. 856-864.	131
Taylor, R.D. <i>et al.</i> (2002), "A review of protein-small molecule docking methods", <i>Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design</i> , Vol. 16, pp. 151-166.	130 (R)
Kokalj, A. (1999), "XCrySDen - a new program for displaying crystalline structures and electron densities", <i>Journal of Molecular Graphics and Modelling</i> , Vol. 17, pp. 176-179.	122
Oprea, T.I. (2000), "Property distribution of drug-related chemical databases", <i>Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design</i> , Vol. 14, pp. 251-264.	113
Pearlman, R.S., Smith, K.M. (1999), "Metric validation and the receptor-relevant subspace concept", <i>Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences</i> , Vol. 39, pp. 28-35.	112 (S)
Clark, R.D. <i>et al.</i> (2002), "Consensus scoring for ligand/protein interactions", <i>Journal of Molecular Graphics and Modelling</i> , Vol. 20, pp. 281-295.	103 (S)

Wang, R.X. <i>et al.</i> (2002), "Further development and validation of empirical scoring functions for structure-based binding affinity prediction", <i>Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design</i> , Vol. 16, pp. 11-26.	102
Katritzky, A.R. <i>et al.</i> (2000), "Structurally diverse quantitative structure-property relationship correlations of technologically relevant physical properties", <i>Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences</i> , Vol. 40, pp. 1-18.	100
Rusinko, A. <i>et al.</i> (1999), "Analysis of a large structure/biological activity data set using recursive partitioning", <i>Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences</i> , Vol. 39, pp. 1017-1026.	97
Gillet, V.J. <i>et al.</i> (1998), "Identification of biological activity profiles using substructural analysis and genetic algorithms", <i>Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences</i> , Vol. 38, pp. 165-179.	97

Table 4. Most cited articles in seven chemoinformatics journals (those heading the seven right-hand columns in Table 3) in 1998-2006. R denotes a review and S denotes a software package.

<i>JCICS</i> 1997-1998		<i>JCICS</i> 2006		Chemoinformatics papers	
Country	%	Country	%	Country	%
USA	40.6	USA	29.9	USA	34.1
England	10.4	England	12.6	Germany	10.5
France	5.8	Germany	10.4	England	10.5
Germany	5.8	Japan	5.0	PR China	6.7
Slovenia	5.5	India	4.3	France	6.1
Japan	4.3	Italy	4.0	Spain	4.9
Romania	4.3	Canada	3.2	Italy	4.5
Croatia	4.0	France	3.2	Japan	3.5
Russia	3.7	Spain	3.2	India	3.1
PR China	3.2	Switzerland	3.2	Switzerland	2.8

Table 5. Most productive countries for 347 papers in *JCICS* 1997-98 (taken from (Onodera, 2001)), for 278 papers in *JCICS* 2006, and for 4411 documents in seven chemoinformatics journals in 1998-2006.

Research centre	%
National Institute of Chemistry, Ljubljana	1.6
University of Erlangen-Nurnberg	1.6
University of Sheffield	1.6
University of Minnesota	1.5
Environmental Protection Agency	1.1
Russian Academy of Sciences	1.1
Liverpool John Moores University	1.0
Pennsylvania State University	1.0
Chinese Academy of Sciences	1.0
University of Cambridge	1.0

Table 6. Most productive research centres for 4411 documents in seven chemoinformatics journals in 1998-2006.