The Council of State Governments (CSG) and Elsevier are proud to partner on this report to analyze the research strengths of the United States. Using a variety of data sources, including Scopus—Elsevier’s proprietary abstract and citation database of peer-reviewed research literature—this report assesses where states have a comparative advantage in research and how they can capitalize on those advantages to drive innovation, attract jobs, and foster economic growth.

As the only organization that serves all three branches of state government, CSG plays a unique role in informing and bringing together state decision-makers. A key focus of CSG’s policy work in 2015 is the “State Pathways to Prosperity” initiative, designed to assist states in growing their economies through workforce and economic development strategies based on nonpartisan, evidence-based research. By providing its members and the broader public with comparative state information—particularly which research fields states specialize in and how researchers collaborate across state lines and internationally—CSG aims to spur and inform discussions about research funding and prioritization and how the policy goals of a state align with the goals and expertise of its research institutions.

With more than a century’s experience in providing research information and tools, Elsevier works closely with the global science and health communities. Every day, Elsevier serves more than 30 million scientists, students, and health and information professionals in over 180 countries by delivering journals, books and research databases. Through its unique vantage point on the world of research, Elsevier can help leaders in the world of research shape and implement larger research strategies.

This report combines CSG’s strong state- and national-level policy expertise with Elsevier’s experience in quantitative research performance evaluation to offer state decision-makers a new, data-driven perspective on the strengths of their research institutions and the national and international connections among those institutions.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Research and development is a critical contributor to innovation and long-term economic growth, and the United States has a long history of being a global leader.

As the United States’ economy gains momentum, everyone—with the goals and expertise of its research institutions—should states and institutions place their bets and invest from legislators and regional planners to corporations and other research fields. For example, how does Colorado’s research in environmental science compare to its research in medicine? Second, a state’s performance in a given research field was compared to other states’ performances in the same research field. For instance, how is Colorado’s research in environmental science relative to Maryland’s research in environmental science?

From 2004–2013, 28.7 percent of the country’s total research output—or about 14 million publications—was in medicine. Engineering and biochemistry, and genetics & molecular biology were the two fields with the next highest levels of research output at 17.4 percent and 15.4 percent, respectively.

Within medicine, the top 3 states in terms of relative volume were Minnesota, Rhode Island and North Carolina. Within engineering, the top 3 states in terms of relative volume were New Mexico, Idaho and Virginia. Within biochemistry, genetics & molecular biology, the top 3 states in terms of relative volume were Maryland, North Carolina and Nebraska.

In assessing a state’s research performance, it is important to take into account not just the volume of research produced, but the quality of that research as well. One way to evaluate this is to look at citations, which are widely recognized as a proxy for quality.

This report uses a measure called field-weighted citation impact, also known as FWCI, which offers a more nuanced and useful measure than simply comparing absolute counts of citations across years and states. For example, different states have different research strengths and citations in research from one field may accumulate faster than others because that field simply produces more publications. Field-weighted citation impact analysis takes this into account.

Massachusetts and California achieved the highest field-weighted citation impacts among all states from 2004 to 2013. Other states with high field-weighted citation impacts for their respective region include Washington (second among all states in the West), Minnesota (first among all states in the Midwest), North Carolina (first among all states in the East), and Maryland (second among all states in the East and third among all states overall).

Research Focus

In order to identify the fields in which a state has a comparative advantage in research, this report looks at two indicators—relative volume and relative impact—along two dimensions. First, a state’s performance in a given research field was compared to its own performance in other research fields. For example, how does Colorado’s research in environmental science compare to its research in medicine? Second, a state’s performance in a given research field was compared to other states’ performances in the same research field. For instance, how is Colorado’s research in environmental science relative to Maryland’s research in environmental science?

From 2004–2013, 28.7 percent of the country’s total research output—or about 14 million publications—was in medicine. Engineering and biochemistry, and genetics & molecular biology were the two fields with the next highest levels of research output at 17.4 percent and 15.4 percent, respectively.

Within medicine, the top 3 states in terms of relative volume were Minnesota, Rhode Island and North Carolina. Within engineering, the top 3 states in terms of relative volume were New Mexico, Idaho and Virginia. Within biochemistry, genetics & molecular biology, the top 3 states in terms of relative volume were Maryland, North Carolina and Nebraska.
This chapter provides an introduction to and overview of indicators related to research output and impact. These indicators help individual states benchmark themselves to one another and the entire country.

### KEY FINDINGS

#### NATIONAL

**1.7 PUBLICATIONS**

PER 1,000 RESIDENTS

**6.5 PUBLICATIONS**

Per million $USD R&D expenditures

#### TOP STATE

**MASSACHUSETTS**

**7.5** publications produced per 1,000 residents, the highest of any state.

**MINNESOTA**

**10.5** publications produced per million $USD of R&D expenditures, the third rate among all states after Massachusetts and Delaware.

#### TOP RESEARCH FIELDS (NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS)

1. MEDICINE
2. ENGINEERING

#### COLLABORATION PARTNERS

**NEW YORK & MASSACHUSETTS**

From 2004–2013, researchers from these states collaborated on 37,972 publications, of which 43% were in medicine.

#### TOP RESEARCH AREA (RELATIVE CITATION IMPACT)

**COMPUTER SCIENCES**

U.S. research in computer science achieves a field-weighted citation impact of 1.74, or 74% above the world average.

**TENNESSEE**

The field-weighted citation impact of Tennessee’s research grew from 1.54 in 2004 to 1.76 in 2013, or 1.5% per year over the past decade. This was the top growth rate among states that already achieved an impact above the U.S. average (1.49).

**NORTH CAROLINA**

ranked in the top five among all states in both the relative volume of its research in medicine and the relative citation impact of its research in medicine.
1.1 MOTIVATION

In the second half of the twentieth century, a new and quintessentially American type of community emerged in the United States: the city of knowledge. These places were engines of scientific production, filled with high-tech industries, homes for scientific workers and their families, with research universities at their heart. They were the birthplaces of great technological innovations that have transformed the way we work and live, homes for entrepreneurship, and, at times, astounding wealth. Cities of knowledge made the metropolitan areas in which they were located more economically successful during the twentieth century, and they promise to continue to do so in the twenty-first.

Margaret Pugh O’Mara, “Cities of Knowledge: Cold War Science and the Search for the Next Silicon Valley”

Research plays a key role in defining a region’s future economic prosperity. From Silicon Valley to Silicon Alley in New York, the Research Triangle in North Carolina to Kendall Square in Boston/Cambridge, there are countless examples over the past several decades of how research drives innovation, attracts jobs, and fosters economic growth.

Due to the difficulty of gathering comprehensive, long-term data that tracks the larger economic and societal impacts of research, previous studies typically focus on indicators of short-term economic activity, such as the direct level of research and development (R&D) expenditures, the amount of employment generated by those expenditures, and the indirect multiplier effect such expenditures have on a local economy. Some of the most recent and rigorous analyses of the immediate economic impact of research come from the STAR METRICS initiative, which was led by the National Science Foundation (NSF), National Institutes of Health (NIH), and the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP).

Just as important, but more difficult to track, is the long-term impact of research on a region’s economic prosperity. Universities attract and train talented students in the latest technologies and industries. Through analyzing trends in a state’s research performance, this report outlines a process to help policymakers and research decision-makers identify in what areas and along what dimensions their states have research strengths and where they can improve.

1.2 RESEARCH OUTPUT

This report draws on a number of indicators and data sources related to research output and performance. Many of these indicators are related to the output of peer-reviewed publications.

For academic researchers, peer-reviewed publications are the medium by which they both communicate new ideas and assess each other’s contributions. Scholarly peer review is a practice by which a drafted paper or manuscript is scrutinized by other experts in the same field; the draft will be published only if those experts determine that it is suitable for publication.

Research output for a given entity—whether it is an individual university or institution, a state or a country—is defined as the number of publications with at least one author affiliated with the respective entity.

In 2013, the U.S. published more than 536,000 publications. U.S. research output increased at a compound annual growth rate of 2.93 percent per year over the past decade, which was lower than the compound annual growth rate of the entire world at 5.19 percent. That means that the United States’ share of all publications worldwide actually decreased. In contrast, countries such as China, India and South Korea have grown their research outputs by 15.6 percent, 13.7 percent and 9.3 percent over the past decade respectively.

Which U.S. states have produced the most research during the past 10 years?

Figure 1.1 shows a map of the number of publications for U.S. states from 2004–13, where darker shades indicate a higher level of output. California, New York, Massachusetts, Texas and Pennsylvania produced the largest absolute number of publications. To put this in perspective, the number of publications by California-based researchers in 2013 (almost 92,000) comprised 17.1 percent—more than one-sixth—of the total U.S. publication output and was higher than the entire output of Canada. The combined absolute outputs of the top five states comprised more than 50 percent of the total U.S. output.

Unsurprisingly, states with larger populations tended to produce more publications. Figure 1.2 displays a similar map for U.S. states’ publication output in 2013 per 1,000 residents. The U.S. as a whole produced 1.7 publications per 1,000 residents. While states such as Massachusetts and Maryland produced high levels of research per capita (7.5 and 6.6 publications per 1,000 residents, respectively), states with smaller populations such as Rhode Island (4.2 publications per 1,000 residents), New Mexico (3.8 publications per 1,000 residents) and Connecticut (3.5 publications per 1,000 residents) also performed quite well.

Figure 1.1—Number of Publications for U.S. States, 2004-2013. Source: Scopus

Figure 1.2—Number of Publications for U.S. States, 2004-2013 per 1,000 Residents. Source: Scopus
Which states increased their publication output the most?

Figure 1.3 plots publication output (scaled from 0 to 1 by each state’s percentile relative to all other states) against growth in publication output volume. States with small outputs overall tended to grow the most—South Dakota, North Dakota, and Wyoming grew their annual research output by 10.8 percent, 6.1 percent and 5.4 percent per year respectively. Florida stood out as a state that achieved both a high level of publication output (210,016 publications; 9th overall and in the top quintile of all states) and a high compound annual growth rate over the past decade (5.1 percent per year, 7th among all states).

Which sectors contributed the most to Florida’s growth?

Growth in Florida’s research output can primarily be traced to its academic sector. As Figure 1.4 demonstrates, research output from Florida universities and research institutions grew from 13,465 publications in 2004 to 20,688 publications in 2013 (an increase of 7,223 publications, 5.0 percent compound annual growth rate). However, research output from the medical sector (hospitals not otherwise affiliated with universities), such as the Mayo Clinic Hospital in Jacksonville and the Cleveland Clinic Florida in Weston, comprised a small but important percentage of the state’s total (5.41 percent). In absolute numbers, the size of Florida’s medical sector’s research output is 8th among all states, as shown in Figure 1.5. More importantly, Florida’s medical sector’s output grew 5.5 percent per year, a rate faster than all other sectors for the state and faster than the U.S. medical sector as a whole (4.0 percent).

Figure 1.2—Number of Publications Per 1,000 Residents for U.S. States, 2013. Source: Scopus® and the U.S. Census Bureau

Figure 1.3—Scatterplot of Publication Output Versus Compound Annual Growth Rate in Publication Output for U.S. States, 2004–2013. Scaled from 0 to 1 by percentile. South Dakota is excluded from figure because the state’s compound annual growth rate was an extreme outlier. Source: Scopus®

Figure 1.4—Distribution of Growth in Research Output for Florida Across Sectors, 2004–2013. * Source: Scopus®

Figure 1.5
In assessing a state’s research performance, it is important to take into account both the volume and the quality of research output. Citations are widely recognized as a proxy for quality.

A publication usually cites or makes formal references to previous works upon whose findings or ideas the research builds. The number of citations a publication receives from subsequently published articles is often interpreted as a proxy of the quality or importance of that publication.

Since it takes time for publications to accumulate citations, it is normal that the total number of citations for a state’s cumulative publications is lower for the most recent years. Moreover, different states have different research strengths, and citations in research from one field may accumulate faster than others because that field simply produces more publications. Therefore, instead of comparing absolute counts of citations across years and states, this report recommends using a citation measure called field-weighted citation impact (also known as FWCI) that adjusts for these differences.

Field-weighted citation impact divides the number of citations received by a publication by the average number of citations received by publications in the same field, of the same type, and published in the same year. The world average is indexed to a value of 1.00. Values above 1.00 indicate above-average citation impact, and values below 1.00 likewise indicate below-average citation impact. For example, a state with a field-weighted citation impact of 1.16 indicates that the average paper from that state was cited 16 percent above the world average whereas a state with a field-weighted citation impact of 0.91 indicates that the average paper from that state was cited 9 percent below the world average.

The overall field-weighted citation impact of all U.S. research output from 2004 to 2013 was 1.49. Figure 1.6 shows a map of all the states and their respective field-weighted citation impacts. Massachusetts and Washington achieved the highest field-weighted citation impacts among all states at 2.10 and 2.03, respectively. Other states with high field-weighted citation impacts for their respective regions include California (1.94, third overall and second among all states in the West), Maryland (1.80, fourth overall and second among all states in the East), Minnesota (1.86, fifth overall and first among all states in the Midwest), and North Carolina (1.80, seventh overall and first among all states in the South). In contrast to Figure 1.1, there is a much more even distribution of highly impactful research throughout the country.

While the relative positions of states on this measure are mostly stable over time, some states significantly improved the citation impact of their research over the past ten years. For example, the field-weighted citation impact of Tennessee’s research output grew 1.50 percent per year from 1.54 in 2004 (25th among all states) to 1.76 in 2013 (14th among all states). This was the highest growth rate in field-weighted citation impact among all states that had a field-weighted citation impact above the U.S. average.

More importantly, as the next section illustrates, different states—and not necessarily those with the highest research expenditures or outputs—have comparative advantages in different fields.

Although there is a positive correlation between a state’s research output and its field-weighted citation impact (see Figure 1.7), many states have field-weighted citation impacts that are higher than one would otherwise predict from a linear regression. This includes both those with smaller absolute levels of output such as Rhode Island, New Hampshire and Vermont and those with larger absolute levels such as Minnesota and Washington.
The chapter analyzes the distribution of outputs by field, identifying states’ comparative research strengths.

Figure 1.7—Publication Output Versus Field-Weighted Citation Impact for U.S. States, 2004–2013. Source: Scopus®
Normalized from 0 to 1 by percentile. Best-fit straight line added.
2.1 RESEARCH FOCUS

In order to identify the fields in which a state has a comparative advantage in research, this report looks at two indicators—relative volume and relative impact—along two dimensions. First, a state’s performance in a given research field was compared to its own performance in other research fields. For example, how does Colorado’s research in environmental science compare to its research in medicine? Second, a state’s performance in a given research field was compared to other states’ performances in the same research field. For instance, how is Colorado’s research in environmental science relative to Maryland’s research in environmental science?

Analogous to the location quotient for an industry, the relative volume of a state’s research output in a field takes into account the total amount of research that a state produces. A value above 1.00 indicates that the state produces a higher proportion of its research output in that field than the national average and vice versa. For example, even though research in agricultural and biological sciences comprise only 8.4 percent of Alabama’s total research output from 2004 to 2013, the state’s relative volume in this field of 1.18 indicates that its output is 18 percent higher than the national average.

As mentioned in the previous section, the field-weighted citation impact provides a normalized measure of citation counts. Both the relative volume and the field-weighted citation impact of research output enable comparisons across different research fields.

For consistency, in all subsequent figures that use indicators across fields, those fields are arranged in a way such that those closely related to each other are placed next to each other on the axis or along the edge of the chart.

This section provides in-depth case studies of several states that have distinct comparative advantages in various research fields. It is not meant to be a comprehensive report of every state’s research strengths, but rather an outline of the process by which one can use different indicators to identify and showcase such strengths.

Relative to the total world output, the U.S. produced a particularly high relative volume of research in psychology (3.6 percent of total U.S. research output compared to 2.2 percent of total world output) and neuroscience (3.8 percent of total U.S. research output compared to 2.5 percent of total world output).

As Figure 2.2 shows, the relative citation impact of the total U.S. research output tended to be well above the world average across all fields. The fields in which the U.S. achieved the highest field-weighted citation impacts are: computer science (1.74); materials science (1.62); economics, econometrics and finance (1.62); arts and humanities (1.61); and chemistry (1.61). For all of these areas, Massachusetts was among the top four states in terms of field-weighted citation impact.
Case Study: North Carolina

When one talks about ground-breaking research in medicine, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Minnesota first come to mind due to their strong medical schools and hospital systems, including Johns Hopkins University, the National Institutes of Health, Harvard Medical School and its affiliated teaching hospitals, and the Mayo Clinic. Based on its performance along multiple research metrics, North Carolina should also be included in that conversation.

North Carolina ranked third among all states (and first in the south) in terms of the relative volume of research in medicine, producing 35 percent more than the U.S. average. As Figure 2.3 shows below, relative to the U.S. average, the distribution of North Carolina's research skews strongly toward the health sciences.

From 2004 to 2013, North Carolina's field-weighted citation impact in medicine was 2.15, fourth among all states and trailing only Maryland, Massachusetts and Georgia. As Figure 2.4 shows, North Carolina's field-weighted citation impact in medicine was the highest across all other fields for the state, outpacing the field-weighted citation impact in fields that more closely align with major companies in North Carolina's Research Triangle region for economics and finance (1.95), biochemistry, genetics and molecular biology (1.76) and computer science (1.75).

In addition to marketing itself as a hub for finance, life sciences and technology, these indicators suggest that the state can also showcase its strengths in medicine.
Case Study: New York

When people think of tech meccas, they usually think of California and Silicon Valley, the greater Seattle area and Microsoft or Boston/Cambridge and Route 128. New York’s Silicon Alley should increasingly be added to that conversation.

From 2004–2013, New York achieved a relative volume of 1.18 in computer science, fourth among all states. Compared to New York’s research in other fields, its relative volume in computer science ranked second after only neuroscience (1.23). New York’s 62,200 publications comprised 13.6 percent of all U.S. publications in computer science, second only to California, which had 96,996 publications and 21.2 percent of the U.S. publication share. Those 62,200 publications comprised 11.1 percent of all research output by New York.

At 1.89, the field-weighted citation impact of New York’s research in computer science ranked 10th among all states and 4th among all research fields for New York.

All of these indicators suggest that New York has a distinct research advantage in computer science. As Bruce Katz and Jennifer Bradley detail in their book, “The Metropolitan Revolution,” New York City has already identified computer science and related areas as a distinct strength to further build on. New York City’s Applied Science Initiative is a good example of how city leaders identified research areas in which the city had a growing strength and then made additional investments in those areas.

Katz and Bradley note, “For its part, New York City already had a few tech clusters—some quite established, others just emerging. There was what one report called ‘a better than average foundation of (information technology) and biotech companies that could easily be built upon as well as a large and growing digital media sector. Since these and many of the city’s other clusters, such as fashion, media, and health care, needed engineering and technical talent, the NYEDC [New York City Economic Development Corporation] concluded that the game changer they were looking for would be a new science and engineering graduate campus.”

After a year-long competition in which universities around the world were invited to submit proposals to build campuses, the city actually moved forward with three ideas—a joint Cornell and Technion-Israel Institute of Technology graduate school on Roosevelt Island, a New York University campus called the Center for Urban Science and Progress, and Columbia University’s new Institute of Data Sciences and Engineering.

Similar to Figure 2.4, Figure 2.5 plots the relative volume versus the field-weighted citation impact of New York’s research outputs across different fields. While New York achieves a field-weighted citation impact well above the world and U.S. national average in most research fields, those in the upper right quadrant of the graph—medicine; computer science; economics, econometrics and finance; and neuroscience—are fields in which the state has a critical mass of highly impactful research. They are the most promising areas for the state to further invest in and showcase its research strengths.

![Figure 2.5 — Field-Weighted Citation Impact Versus Relative Volume of New York’s Research Output Across Subject Areas, 2004–2013. Source: Scopus](image_url)
Case Study: Arkansas

Research in business, management, & accounting comprised 3.4 percent of all research output from Arkansas, but the state has a distinct comparative advantage in this field.

Buoyed by the Sam Walton College of Business at the University of Arkansas, the relative volume of Arkansas’s research from 2004–2013 in this field was 1.54, the fourth highest among all fields for Arkansas. Only research in agricultural & biological sciences; veterinary sciences; and pharmacology, toxicology, & pharmaceutics had a higher relative volume in Arkansas.

The state’s relative volume in business, management & accounting ranked second among all states in the U.S.; only Oklahoma had a higher level at 1.65. In addition, Arkansas’s annual research output in this area grew by 10.67% per year, from 49 publications in 2004 to 122 in 2013.

Arkansas’s research in business, management, & accounting was quite impactful, achieving a field-weighted citation impact of 2.05, the fourth highest level among all states in this field. Only Arizona (2.33), New Hampshire (2.29), and Massachusetts (2.21) achieved higher levels. Likewise, as Figure 2.6 shows, across other fields for Arkansas, only the state’s research output in decision sciences (a closely-related field) attained a higher field-weighted citation impact.

Given the high location-relative concentration of farming, fishing, and forestry occupations in Arkansas, it is not surprising that research in agricultural & biological sciences comprised 16.7% of the state’s total research output (and a relative volume of 2.36, the highest across all fields for Arkansas). However, as Figure 2.6 demonstrates, the field-weighted citation impact of Arkansas’s research in agricultural & biological sciences was 1.12, slightly above the world average of 1.00 and below the national average of 1.41.

Figure 2.6 — Field-Weighted Citation Impact of Arkansas’s Research Output Across Fields, 2004–2013. Fields with an asterisk (*) or caret (^) indicate that the total output of the state in that field was less than 100 publications in 2004 or 2013 respectively. Source: Scopus®
3.1 RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURES

Research and development expenditures play important roles in the larger context of states’ research ecosystems. According to the National Science Foundation’s Higher Education Research and Development Survey, in 2013 U.S. higher education institutions spent $67 billion on research and development. When adjusted for inflation and accounting for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, increases in total research and development expenditures have slowed in the most recent years, and the percentage of expenditures from federal funding agencies has actually declined. 17

Moreover, as the National Institutes of Health’s Data Book details, the average success rate for National Institutes of Health grants continues to fall. 18 The combination of these pressures—less overall research and development money to distribute and more intense competition for that money—has forced universities and states to a) be more strategic about which research areas they invest in, b) collaborate and pool together funds to enable larger projects, and c) showcase their research strengths to improve their applications and chances of winning those grants.

In the face of these pressures, some states have been more successful than others when maintaining and even growing their total research and development expenditures.

From 2004–2013, the top states in terms of total research and development expenditures were: California ($80.6 billion), New York ($48.5 billion), Texas ($43.1 billion), Maryland ($31.6 billion), Pennsylvania ($30.7 billion) and Massachusetts ($28.5 billion). These six states accounted for 42.8 percent of all U.S. higher education research and development expenditures over this period.

The top five states in terms of growth in research and development expenditures were: Rhode Island (6.90 percent), South Dakota (5.42 percent), North Carolina (4.53 percent), Washington (3.71 percent) and Delaware (3.61 percent).

As Figure 3.1 shows, North Carolina and Massachusetts both secured high levels of total research and development expenditures and also grew those levels significantly.

Given these differences in total research expenditures, which states tend to produce the highest number of publications relative to their level of Research and development funding? 20 As a benchmark, U.S. universities as a whole produced 6.5 publications per million USD of research and development (in 2013 dollars) from 2004–2013. Massachusetts universities produced 12.7 publications per million USD of research and development funding. The rest of the top five states were: Delaware (11.4 publications), Minnesota (10.5 publications), Wyoming (10.3 publications) and Connecticut (10.3 publications).

The distribution of the sources of a state’s research and development funding is another important consideration, affecting how exposed or insulated that state’s research ecosystem is to federal or state funding pressures.

For the U.S. in 2013, about 58.9 percent of total research and development expenditures came from federal funding agencies.

The top five states in terms of federal funding as a percentage of their total research and development expenditures were: Wyoming (82.4 percent), Maryland (79.0 percent), Colorado (74.5 percent), New Hampshire (73.8 percent) and Vermont (73.6 percent).

North Dakota (38.8 percent) and Arkansas (39.1 percent) had the lowest relative levels of federal funding. On the other hand, North Dakota and Arkansas ranked first and second, respectively, in terms of the relative levels of state/local funding as a percentage of their total research and development expenditures (21.3 percent and 25.4 percent).

The states with the highest percentages of their total research and development originating from neither federal nor state/local funding sources were Rhode Island (53.2 percent) and Nebraska (52.8 percent). These states led all others in terms of relative institutional contributions to research and development funding (44.7 percent and 42.1 percent, respectively).

Although funding from business and industry comprises only 5.2 percent of total research and development expenditures at U.S. universities, they play an increasingly important role, especially as funding from federal and state/local sources become more competitive. As Figure 3.2 shows, across all states, North Carolina attained the highest relative level of research and development funding from business at 9.8 percent.

Figure 3.1—Compound Annual Growth Rate, Total Research and Development Expenditures Versus Total Research and Development Expenditures by Percentile for U.S. States, 2004–2013. Research and development expenditures calculated and normalized to 2013 dollars. Source: National Science Foundation, Higher Education Research and Development Survey.
Another important input for research is space. This report uses data from the National Science Foundation’s 2011 Survey of Science and Engineering Research Facilities to calculate how many net assignable square feet of research space is available across different states. Dividing a state’s research output by its net assignable square feet produces another measure of how efficient that state is in terms of producing research.\(^2\)

Across the U.S., academic institutions produced on average 0.8 publications per 1,000 net assignable square feet. Rhode Island was the top-ranked state; in 2011, its academic institutions produced 4.7 publications per 1,000 net assignable square feet.

Massachusetts and Vermont were second and third, with 4.6 and 4.0 publications, respectively. When this analysis is restricted to just medical publications from academic institutions per 1,000 net assignable square feet of medical school research space,\(^3\) Massachusetts and Rhode Island led all states with 9.9 and 7.4 publications, respectively.

Figure 3.3 plots publications from academic institutions versus net assignable square feet; states with high levels of publications per 1,000 net assignable square feet are highlighted.
3.3 HUMAN CAPITAL: FACULTY

The total number of faculty at states’ universities is another important aspect of a state’s research inputs. This section draws on data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System Human Resources Survey.

In terms of academic faculty per 1,000 residents, the top five states in 2013 were Rhode Island (3.40), Vermont (3.11), Massachusetts (3.09), North Dakota (2.98), and Iowa (2.61).

In 2013, across the entire U.S., academic faculty produced 0.77 publications on average.

In terms of publications from academic institutions per academic faculty per year, the top five states in 2013 were Massachusetts (2.12 publications per faculty), Maryland (1.97), Connecticut (1.49), Washington (1.39), and California (1.32).

West Virginia stood out for having both a high level of publications per faculty and a strong growth rate in the number of publications per faculty over the past ten years. In 2004, its faculty produced 0.93 publications on average, while in 2013, its faculty produced 1.30 publications on average.

This chapter looks at several measures of knowledge transfer between academia and other sectors. Such indicators can provide greater insights into the extent to which a state’s research contributes to innovation. This chapter also looks at the research collaboration networks among states, highlighting which states collaborate the most and in what areas.
4.1 RESEARCH BY SECTOR

Although universities produce the majority of research output, the larger research ecosystem spans government labs, corporations, hospitals, not-for-profit think-tanks, and other institutions. It is important to understand the distribution of a state’s research output across different sectors. When researchers and knowledge workers can easily collaborate with and move across different sectors, all stakeholders benefit from the exchange of ideas and talent. In order for states to maximally benefit, there needs to be a critical mass of research occurring across academia, government, and business and a robust triple-helix ecosystem spanning those sectors that enables such cross-fertilization.

Research suggests that proximity plays a key role in fostering university-industry collaboration and exchange. States with low levels of research outside the academic sector—particularly the corporate sector—have to work harder to develop academic-corporate collaborations and other connections that facilitate knowledge transfer. States with high levels of research output outside the academic sector have a head-start, but they still need to make sure the different sectors are connected to one another. About 8.5 percent of all published U.S. research is conducted by corporate institutions. Figure 4.1 shows a heat map of the relative percentage of each state’s total output from the corporate sector.

From 2004–2013, 20.8 percent of New Jersey’s total output (33,504 publications) was from corporate researchers, the highest among all states in the country and more than twice the rate of the entire country. The states with the next highest relative levels of corporate output were Delaware (13.9 percent), California (13.2 percent) and New York (10.9 percent).

Figure 4.2 presents the fields in which New Jersey corporations produced the highest number of publications. The orange or top bar denotes the relative percentage of New Jersey’s corporate publications in that field. The olive or middle bar denotes the relative percentage of all U.S. corporate publications, not just those from corporations based in New Jersey, in that field. The blue or bottom bar denotes the relative percentage of all U.S. corporate publications, not just those from corporations based in New Jersey, in that field. When the orange or top bar is longer than the olive or middle bar, it means that New Jersey’s corporate sector produced a higher relative volume in that field compared to the other sectors (academic, government, other). Likewise, when the orange or top bar is longer than the blue or bottom bar, that means New Jersey’s corporate sector produced a higher relative volume in that field compared to all other corporations in the U.S.

The fields in which New Jersey corporations have a strong comparative research advantage are those in which the orange or top bar is much longer than the other two bars. 8,830 publications or 26.4 percent of all of New Jersey’s corporate publications were in the field of medicine, the highest among all fields. More significantly, as Figure 4.2 shows, research in pharmacology, toxicology and pharmaceutics comprised 15.2 percent of New Jersey corporate publications, twice the rate of the state’s total research output (6.0 percent) and that of the U.S. total corporate research output (7.4 percent). There is a high concentration of pharmaceutical companies—and particularly their R&D operations—in New Jersey, and these measures suggest that they play an outsized role in driving New Jersey’s larger research ecosystem, both vis-à-vis its universities and its research corporations in other industries.
4.2 RESEARCH USAGE

Research on publication downloads and other usage metrics is an emerging topic within the bibliometric community, and it is increasingly proposed as a proxy for research awareness. Whereas citation measures take time to accrue, usage metrics have the potential to provide almost immediate insights into developing research areas and trends.\(^29\) The number of publication downloads\(^30\) from a particular field, institution or country may be interpreted as representing the interest in and use of research. This report uses full text article download data from Elsevier’s ScienceDirect database, which provides approximately 20 percent of the world’s published journal articles, to offer another perspective on how an institution’s research is being used around the world. Similar to citations, downloads tend to go down in more recent years because recent publications have not had time to accumulate enough downloads. So, this report first normalizes the number of downloads an entity receives to its publications by the total number of downloads of all U.S. publications in a given year—this is called an entity’s national download share. Then, since entities that produce more research output in general will have higher counts of downloads of that output, this report compares the entity’s national download share to its corresponding national publication share (the number of publications an entity produces divided by the number of all U.S. publications in a given year).

As Figure 4.4 shows, for most states, there is a strong correlation between their national download share and their national publication share, indicating that their share of all downloads globally is similar to their share of all publications globally. What about those that deviate from the trend? Massachusetts and Maryland are above the trend line (the ratios of their national download share to publication share were 1.21 and 1.30, respectively). This means that their publications were downloaded more often than could be expected based on their volume of publications. Across all of Maryland’s research outputs, the national download to publication share ratio was highest for veterinary sciences (1.81). Downloads of Maryland’s research in veterinary sciences comprised 13.4 percent of all downloads of U.S. research in veterinary sciences. Indicators of citation impact also reflected the strength of Maryland’s research in veterinary sciences; it achieved a field-weighted citation index of 1.93 from 2004-2013, ranked fourth among all states.

Another potential measure of the larger impact of research is how widely that research is read. For example:

\(\gg\) A total of 68.4 percent of U.S. research published in 2004–2013 was downloaded by readers from outside the U.S.

\(\gg\) Research from Mississippi and Nevada had the highest rates of international readership. 73.5 percent and 73.3 percent of downloads of those states’ research output were by readers from outside the U.S.

\(\gg\) In particular, Mississippi and Nevada’s research in biochemistry, genetics and molecular biology had higher rates of international readership (74.2 percent and 70.3 percent) than the U.S. average for that field (64.1 percent).

For some other states, government labs and agencies constitute a large proportion their total research output and 11.4 percent of all U.S. research output.

As Figure 4.3 shows, more than 50 percent of New Mexico’s total research output originated at government labs—in this case, Los Alamos and Sandia National Laboratories. Likewise, 45.7 percent of Maryland’s total research output, which itself comprises 28.4 percent of all government research output in the U.S., comes from government institutions such as the National Institutes of Health. No other state comes close in terms of the relative skew of research output by the government sector, though Idaho (25.1 percent), West Virginia (17.5 percent) and Virginia (16.7 percent) are also home to government labs with large relative research outputs.

**Figure 4.3** Percentage of Total State Output from Government Institutions, 2004 - 13. Source: Scopus®
There is increasing interest in creating more and better indicators of the commercialization of research to assess how the results of research are transferred from the academic sector to the corporate or government sectors. Academic patent citations, defined as formal citations of academic publications in industry patents, provide one way of understanding corporate usage of academic research. They can be used as a proxy for measuring how much academic research contributes to innovation.

Past studies suggest that academic researchers and industry interact in a multitude of channels beyond academic co-authorship, and counting patent citations is one of several lenses for understanding the linkage between academic research and intellectual property.

From 2004–2013, 959,172 patents were granted to U.S. inventors. California, with 25.1 percent of all patents granted to U.S. inventors, had a national patent share more than three times the level of the next closest state, Texas (7.1 percent). The remaining top five states in terms of patents granted were New York (6.4 percent), Massachusetts (4.5 percent), and Washington (4.2 percent).

While California and especially Silicon Valley generates a high level of innovation, these statistics otherwise obscure how much the research produced by other states contributes to patents.

In terms of patent citation share relative to U.S. publication share, as Figure 4.5 shows, research from across the country—particularly in the Northeast—are cited in patents at rates higher than their underlying publication shares. The top states in terms of this normalized patent citation indicator were: Massachusetts (1.69), Maryland (1.54), Maine (1.45), Michigan (1.40) and Washington (1.38). This means that these states’ research outputs had a much greater impact on innovation than their research volume would otherwise suggest.

New York’s research in computer science from 2004–2012 was cited in 1,026 patents, comprising 23.5 percent of all patent citations in that field. It had a patent citation share to national publication share ratio of 1.73, the highest among all states. This suggests that the state’s research in computer science has a much greater impact on innovation than its national publication volume would suggest.
Studies have shown that teams produce more creative and impactful research than single authors do. From 2004–2013, single-authored publications in the U.S. achieved a field-weighted citation impact of 0.80, below the world average field-weighted citation impact of 1.00 and well below the U.S. overall average of 1.49. The percentage of the United States’ total research publications that were single-authored declined from 17.5 percent in 2004 to 13.4 percent in 2013, consistent with the global trend.

This section focuses on a particular type of team collaborations—those that span multiple U.S. states—which measures interstate research collaborations through co-authorship. For example, when a publication has one author from the University of Kentucky and another author from the University of Kansas, this report defines that to be a collaboration between the states of Kentucky and Kansas.

States with large research outputs tend to have more collaborations than other states, which is addressed by using a normalized measure of collaboration—called Salton’s measure of collaboration strength—that takes into account the size of each state’s total research output. The values of Salton’s measure can vary between 0 (where there are no co-authored publication between a given pair of states) and 1 (in which every publication of each state was a collaboration with the other state). In practice, the range typically seen at state level is between 0.000 and 0.080 for most pairings of significant size.

Even when the size of states’ research outputs is taken into account, the most prolific pairs of states tended to be those with the highest research outputs overall. For example:

- California and Massachusetts show strong ties. There were 53,148 co-authored publications between researchers from California and Massachusetts, with the highest Salton’s measure of 0.0833 among all pairs of U.S. states. More than 1 in 10 publications by Massachusetts’ researchers were co-authored with researchers from California.
- A total of 35.2 percent of the collaborations between California and Massachusetts were in medicine. This is higher than the overall percentage of California’s research output in medicine (25.7 percent) but close to the overall percentage of Massachusetts’ research in medicine (34.1 percent).
- New York has strong research connections with all of its neighbors. State-to-state research collaborations between New York and one of its neighbors account for three of the top 10 such partnerships in the U.S.
- From 2004–2013, researchers from Massachusetts and New York collaborated on 37,972 publications, of which 43 percent were in medicine.
- After medicine, New York and New Jersey collaborated the most in physics and astronomy. Collaborations in that field comprised 19.4 percent of all New York to New Jersey co-authored papers, even though only 11.3 percent of New York’s total research output was in physics and astronomy.

Case Study: Nevada’s Interstate Research Collaborations
- Between 2004 and 2013, Nevada researchers collaborated the most with researchers from California in both an absolute and relative sense.
- The highest proportions of Nevada-California collaborations were in medicine (23.1 percent) and physics and astronomy (19.0 percent). These rates were much higher than Nevada’s baseline level of research in these areas, 18.1 percent and 12.7 percent, respectively.
- After California, the state which Nevada researchers collaborated with the most was Arizona.

| Table 4.1—Research Collaboration Partnerships between U.S. States, 2004–2013. Pairings are sorted by Salton’s measure of collaboration strength. Source: Scopus® |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rank | State 1 | State 2 | Number of co-authored publications | Co-authored publications as % of state 1’s total output | Co-authored publications as % of state 2’s total output | Salton’s Measure |
| 1 | CA | MA | 53,148 | 6.3% | 11.0% | 0.0833 |
| 2 | CA | NY | 56,736 | 6.7% | 10.1% | 0.0826 |
| 3 | CA | MD | 42,985 | 5.1% | 12.4% | 0.0795 |
| 4 | MA | NY | 37,972 | 7.8% | 6.8% | 0.0729 |
| 5 | MA | MD | 29,123 | 6.0% | 8.4% | 0.0710 |
| 6 | NJ | NY | 20,683 | 12.9% | 3.7% | 0.0689 |
| 7 | MD | NY | 30,410 | 8.7% | 5.4% | 0.0689 |
| 8 | MD | PA | 23,005 | 6.6% | 6.5% | 0.0654 |
| 9 | CA | TX | 36,577 | 4.3% | 9.5% | 0.0644 |
| 10 | NY | PA | 28,270 | 5.0% | 7.9% | 0.0633 |

Figure 4.6—Research Collaboration Partnership between Nevada and Immediate State Neighbors. Source: Scopus®

Note: Thickness of arcs corresponds to Salton’s measure of collaboration strength. Labels correspond to number of collaborations between Nevada and that state between 2004–2013.
CONCLUSIONS

Main Takeaways

Through analyzing four different perspectives—research output and impact, research focus, research inputs, and knowledge transfer and collaboration, this report outlines a process that states can undertake to identify and showcase their research strengths—those areas in which they have a comparative research advantage.

Research Output and Impact

> Within the U.S., the production of research is not evenly balanced but rather concentrated in a few states. The combined absolute number of research publications of the top five states (California, New York, Massachusetts, Texas and Maryland) comprised more than 50 of the total U.S. output.

> Over the past decade, some states have greatly expanded their research enterprise. For example, Florida achieved both a high level of publication output (210,016 publications, ninth overall and in the top quintile of all states) and a high compound annual growth rate (5.1 percent per year, seventh among all states).

> The U.S. produces highly impactful research, which is cited 49 percent more than the world average. Within the U.S., the states that produce the most impactful research are Massachusetts and California.

Research Focus

> The U.S. as a whole specializes in research on medicine and engineering. 28.7 percent and 17.4 percent of the total U.S. research output was in medicine and engineering, respectively.

> North Carolina is an example of one state that particularly specialized in medicine. It ranked in the top five among all states in both the relative volume and the relative citation impact of its research in medicine.

Research Inputs and Efficiency

> Similar to research outputs, the geographic balance of research inputs is not balanced across all states. The top six states in terms of research and development expenditures (California, New York, Texas, Maryland, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts) accounted for 42.8 percent of all U.S. higher education R&D expenditures from 2004–2013.

> The U.S. as a whole produced 6.5 publications per million $USD of research and development expenditures. Some states, such as Massachusetts, were very efficient, producing 13.7 publications per million $USD of research and development expenditures.

Knowledge Transfer and Collaboration

> Although universities produce the majority of research output, it is important to have a critical mass of research occurring across different sectors, such as government and business, to facilitate knowledge transfer. About 8.5 percent of all published U.S. research was conducted by corporate institutions. Some states have a particularly strong corporate research sector. For example, 20.8 percent of New Jersey’s total output was from corporate researchers, the highest among all states in the country.

> Knowledge from U.S. research is transferred not only across academic-corporate boundaries but also national boundaries. 68.4 percent of all U.S. research published in 2004–2013 was downloaded by readers from outside the U.S. Some states’ research drew particularly strong interest from international audiences. For example, research from Mississippi and Nevada had the highest rates of international readership at 73.5 percent and 73.3 percent, respectively.

> Citations of academic research in industry patents represent another way of measuring knowledge transfer. The top states in terms of patent citation share relative to U.S. publication share were Massachusetts (1.69), Maryland (1.54), Maine (1.45), Michigan (1.40) and Washington (1.38). This suggests that those states’ research outputs had a much greater impact on innovation than their national publication volume would otherwise suggest.

With this report, CSG and Elsevier hope to contribute to discussion of how states and institutions can identify and leverage their comparative research strengths. Investing in those strengths helps drive innovation and future economic growth.

State Abbreviations and Region Mappings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>RI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>VT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>WY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analyses of bibliometric data in this report are based upon the theoretical principles of Derek de Solla Price (1978), Eugene Garfield (1979) and Francis Nairn (1976) in the U.S., and Christopher Freeman, Ben Martin and John Irvine in the U.K. (1981, 1987), and several European institutions including the Centre for Science and Technology Studies at Leiden University, the Netherlands, and the Library of the Academy of Sciences in Budapest, Hungary.

The analyses of bibliometric data in this report are based upon recognized advanced indicators. The base assumption is that such indicators are useful and valid, though imperfect and partial, measures of research performance. Their numerical values are determined by not only research performance and related concepts, but also by other, influencing factors that may cause systematic biases. They provide unique perspectives on a state’s research performance, such as:

- How much research is being produced relative to other comparators?
- What types of organizations (beyond universities) are producing this research?
- In what research fields (e.g., chemistry or psychology) is that research concentrated?
- How impactful or influential is this research on other research, and how much is it being used by non-academic audiences?
- How connected is the state’s research enterprise to other states and the rest of the world?

In the past decade, the field of indicators research has developed best practices which state how indicator results should be interpreted and which influencing factors should be taken into account. This report’s methodology builds on these best practices.

Data Sources

The primary data source for this study is the Scopus abstract and citation database of peer-reviewed research literature, which was developed by and is owned by Elsevier. It is the largest abstract and citation database of peer-reviewed research literature in the world, with 56 million documents published in over 22,000 journals, book series and conference proceedings by some 5,000 publishers. Reference lists are captured for 34+ million records published from 1996 onwards, and the additional 21.3 million pre-1996 records reach as far back as the publication year 1823.

Scopus coverage is multi-lingual and global: approximately 16 percent of titles in Scopus are published in languages other than English (or published in both English and another language). In addition, more than half of Scopus content originates from outside North America, representing many countries in Europe, Latin America, Africa and the Asia Pacific region.

The database contains titles from 105 different countries and 40 "local languages" in all geographic regions.

Scopus coverage is also inclusive across all major research fields, with 11,500 titles in the physical sciences, 12,700 in the health sciences, 4,200 in the life sciences, and 9,400 in the social sciences (the latter including some 3,100 arts and humanities related titles). Titles which are covered are predominantly serial publications (journals, trade journals, book series and conference materials), but considerable numbers of conference papers are also covered from stand-alone proceedings volumes (a major dissemination mechanism, particularly in the computer sciences). Acknowledging that a great deal of important literature in all fields (but especially in the social sciences and arts and humanities) is published in books, Scopus now (as of 2015) covers over 75,000 books. See www.elsevier.com/online-tools/scopus for more information.

This report also draws on data from ScienceDirect (publication usage metrics) and LexisNexis [patent citations] that is linked to Scopus. ScienceDirect is Elsevier’s full-text journal articles platform. With an invaluable and incomparable customer base, the usage metrics of scientific research on ScienceDirect.com provide a different look at performance measurement. ScienceDirect.com is used by more than 16,500 institutions worldwide, with more than 15 million active users and over 800 million full-text article downloads per year. The average click through to full text per month is over 65 million. See http://www.elsevier.com/online-tools/sciencedirect for more information.

LexisNexis is a leader in comprehensive and authoritative legal, news and business information and tailored applications. Patent data are obtained via a partnership with LexisNexis and include over 96 million records from over 100 patent authorities, including the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), the European Patent Office (EPO), the Japanese Patent Office (JPO), the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), and the UK Intellectual Property Office (UKIPO). Patent data are grouped by families, which refer to the same invention applied for in different authorities. This report’s analyses are limited to only records from the USPTO. Citations to patents in academic publications are linked between the LexisNexis Patent Database and Scopus using a unique record identifier. See http://www.lexisnexis.com/en-U.S./products/total-patent-page for more information.

This report also draws on data from the National Science Foundation’s Higher Education Research and Development Survey, (HERD), Survey of Science and Engineering Research Facilities, and the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Human Resources Survey.

The Higher Education Research and Development Survey collects information on Research and development expenditures by NSF’s field of research and source of funds (federal, state/local, business, nonprofit, institutional, and other). The survey is an annual census of institutions that expended at least $150,000 in separately budgeted Research and development in the fiscal year (891 such institutions met this threshold in 2013). For statistics that aggregate Research and development expenditures across multiple years (e.g., publications per million $ Research and development expenditures from 2004–2013), all base values were converted to 2013 dollars using the U.S. Department of Labor’s Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index (http://www.bls.gov/cpi/data.htm). For more information, please see http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/srvyherd/.

The Survey of Science and Engineering Research Facilities is a congressionally mandated, biennial survey that collects data on the amount, construction, repair, renovation, and funding of research facilities, as well as the computing and networking capacities at U.S. colleges and universities. The survey is an establishment-based survey completed by institutional coordinators at academic institutions and is a census of all research-performing colleges and universities in the U.S. that expended at least $1 million in research and development funds in any prior fiscal year. For more information, please see http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/srvyfacilities/.

The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) is a system of interrelated surveys conducted annually by the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). This report particularly draws on data from the Human Resources survey, which outlines the number of employees at universities by primary occupational activity, and faculty status/academic rank. For more information, please see http://nces.ed.gov/peeds/resource/survey_components.asp.

### Document types

For all bibliometric analysis, only the following document types are considered:

- Article
- Review
- Conference Proceeding

### Counting

#### Counting Publications

To measure trends in publication output over time, it is customary to group publications (and other indicators derived based on publication outputs, such as citations or co-authorships) based on the calendar year in which they were published.

All analyses make use of whole counting rather than fractional counting. A publication may be counted as a publication of multiple entities if it is a joint work of authors from multiple entities. For example, take the publication entitled Fischer-Tropsch synthesis:
A review of water effects on the performances of unsupported and supported Co catalysts” by Ajay Kumar Dalai and Burtron Davis. It captures all the dimensions by which states convert research and development funding into research outputs. This section outlines some of the key limitations to help readers better understand what can and cannot be inferred from the indicators.

- Research output per million $ research and development provides a high-level indicator of the ability of a state's academic research and development contractors to convert the state's investment in research and development expenditures into publications. To ensure an apples-to-apples comparison, the indicator and other analogous indicators use data on only higher education research and development and output from the academic sector. It is important to note that the results of research enabled by research and development expenditures may not be peer-reviewed publications for several years, or sometimes not at all. These time lags and leaky pipelines in publishing research results vary by field and state and may even be unrelated to the output from the academic sector.

- Research output per 1,000 net assignable square feet (and research output in medicine per 1,000 NASF of medical school research space) provides a high-level indicator of the ability of a state's academic researchers to utilize academic research space efficiently.

Different states specialize in different research fields, and the costs of conducting research vary greatly across fields. More nuanced analyses can take into account how much research and development states have spent in particular fields (such as medicine versus engineering).

Research Usage Metrics

Advantages and disadvantages of using citations as a proxy for research impact | Downloads and citations, as potential indicators of research awareness and impact, have their own advantages and disadvantages. While it is difficult to determine whether an article has been read and used, it is not always possible to determine that a publication has been cited. Citation impact is by definition a lagging indicator. The accumulation of citations takes time.

After publication, articles need to first be discovered and read by the relevant researchers; then, those articles might influence the next wave of studies conducted and procedures implemented. For a subset of those studies, the results are written up, peer-reviewed, and published. Only then can a citation be counted toward that article's impact. Other citations may not be aware of the earlier work, or otherwise fail to cite it. The earlier work supports the claims of the work citing it. The number of citations received by an article from subsequently published articles is a proxy of the quality or importance of the reported research.

Citation is a formal reference to earlier work made in an article or patent, frequently to other journal articles. A citation is used to credit the originator of an idea or finding and is usually used to indicate that a portion of the knowledge corpus of the work citing it. An analogous measure is the relative (download) volume of a state's output in a particular field, which we define in this report as that entity's output. For example, Arkansas's 2013 publications in pharmacology, toxicology, and pharmaceutics have been downloaded 32,575 times so far, which comprise 12.0 percent of all downloads of Arkansas's 2013 publications (271,939). Downloads of all U.S. 2013 research in medicine comprised only 6.0 percent of all downloads of the U.S. 2013 research output. Thus, the relative download volume of Arkansas's 2013 research in medicine was 2.0, or twice the U.S. average.

Salton's measure (also known as Salton's cosine or Salton's index) for the level of collaboration between two partners is calculated by dividing the number of co-authored articles by the geometric mean (square root of the product) of the total article outputs of the two partners. 47 By taking into account the absolute publication output of each constituent partner, the index is a size-independent indicator of the nature and impact of collaborative activities. The values of Salton's Index vary between 0 (where there are no co-authored articles between a given entity and another) and 1 (where all articles from both partners represent co-authorship between them). In practice, the range typically seen at state level is in the range 0.00 to 1.00 for most pairs of significant size. For example, Sectors in this report are used to delimit the parts of the national knowledge economy. The metrics used include Academic, Corporate, Government, Medical, and Other.

Glossary of Terms

CAGR (Compound Annual Growth Rate) is defined as the year- over-year growth rate over a specified period of time. Starting with the first value in any series and applying this rate for each of the time intervals yields the amount in the final value of the series.

\[
CAGR(t_f, t_0) = \left( \frac{V(t_f)}{V(t_0)} \right)^{\frac{1}{t_f-t_0}} - 1
\]

V(t_f) | final value
V(t_0) | initial value
f | number of years.

Citation | is a formal reference to earlier work made in an article or patent, frequently to other journal articles. A citation is used to credit the originator of an idea or finding and is usually used to indicate that a portion of the knowledge corpus of the work citing it. The number of citations received by an article from subsequently published articles is a proxy of the quality or importance of the reported research.

Downloads are defined as either downloading a PDF of an article on ScienceDirect, Elsevier's full-text platform, or looking at the full- text online on ScienceDirect without downloading the actual PDF. Views of abstracts are not included in the definition. Multiple views or downloads of the same article in the same format during a user session will be filtered out, in accordance with the COUNTER Code of Practice 4.4

FWCI (Field-Weighted Citation Impact) is an indicator of mean citation impact, and compares the actual number of citations received by an article with the expected number of citations for articles of the same document type (article, review or conference proceeding paper, publication year and field). The number of articles classified in two or more fields, the harmonic mean of the actual and expected citation rates is used. The indicator is therefore always defined with reference to a global baseline of 1.0 and intraspecifically accounts for differences in citation accrual over time, differences in citation rates for different document types (reviews typically attract more citations than letters) and intraspecifically accounts for differences in citation frequencies overall and over time and document types. It is one of the most sophisticated indicators in the modern bibliometric toolkit.

Highly cited articles (unless otherwise indicated) are those in the top 1 percent. The list includes highly cited articles from both partners represent co-authorship between them). In practice, the range typically seen at state level is in the range 0.00 to 1.00 for most pairs of significant size. For example, Sectors in this report are used to delimit the parts of the national knowledge economy. The metrics used include Academic, Corporate, Government, Medical, and Other.
Academic
- Univ (university): universities and other institutes that grant undergraduate, graduate, and/or Ph.D. degrees as well as engage in research. Examples: Cornell University, Harvard University.
- Coll (college): two or four year degree granting institutions that also engage in research to some degree. Examples of two year colleges: Trinity Valley Community College (http://www.tvcc.edu/), Mira Costa College (http://www.miracosta.cc.ca.us/)
- Meds (medical schools): organizations that offer medical degrees as well as engage in research. Examples: Harvard Medical School, Brown Medical School. We do not designate dental schools and other health related degrees as "meds''.
- Resi (research institutes): organizations whose primary function is to conduct research and may include some educational activities but are not universities. Example: Salk Institute for Biological Studies, Whitehead Institute for Biomedical Research.

Corporate
- Comp (company): commercial entities primarily operating with a profit motive although some so-called non-profit organizations could potentially be classified as companies. Examples: IBM, HP

Government
- Govt (government): includes all levels of government as well as the UN. Example: U.S. Department of Energy, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Medical
- Hosp (hospital): organizations whose primary function is to provide health care although they may also do research. Example: Mayo Clinic, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, St. Jude Children Research Hospital

Other
- Poli (policy institute): policy is the primary function of organizations of "poli" type while they may also engage in research and perhaps even some development. Example: American Institutes of Research.
- Ngov (non-governmental and/or non-profit organization): organizations primarily focused on development and social/ political progress, but nevertheless produce research documents. Example: Red Cross.

Field Classification Systems

Background on All Science Journal Classification (ASJC) System
Journals and conference proceedings (titles) in Scopus are classified under four broad field clusters (life sciences, physical sciences, health sciences and social sciences and humanities) which are further divided into 27 major fields and 334 minor fields. Titles may belong to more than one field, so the sum of an entity's output across all fields may add up to more than 100 percent.

Articles within each title inherit the ASJC four digit codes assigned to the titles they belong to automatically during loading time. Depending on the judgments of the Scopus Content Advisory Board, a title can be categorized in multiple fields.

Scopus 27 Field Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Field</th>
<th>Broad Cluster</th>
<th>Shortened Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General (multidisciplinary journals like Nature and Science)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>Agricultural &amp; Biological Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology</td>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>Biochem &amp; Mol Bio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Management and Accounting</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Business, Mgmt, &amp; Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Chemical Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Computer Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Sciences</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Decision Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth and Planetary Sciences</td>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Earth &amp; Planetary Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics, Econometrics and Finance</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Economics &amp; Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Environmental Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunology and Microbiology</td>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>Immunology &amp; Microbio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Science</td>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Materials Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacology, Toxicology and Pharmaceutics</td>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>Pharmacology &amp; Toxicology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics and Astronomy</td>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Physics &amp; Astronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Sciences</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>Veterinary Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>Health Professions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highly multidisciplinary journals such as Nature, Science, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, and so forth are categorized in a separate field category called General / Multidisciplinary.

These fields do not necessarily map onto the department, program, or school divisions of a particular institution, nor that of other field classification systems, such as that the National Center of Education Statistics (NCES) Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) or the National Science Foundation's Research and Development Fields.
Summary Tables

The following pages provide tables for the top ten states and their performance along several of the main indicators of interest throughout the report.

### Publications per 1,000 Residents (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Publications per 1,000 residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Field-Weighted Citation Impact (FWCI) for U.S. States (2004–2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>FWCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Publications per million $ USD R&amp;D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Total State Output from Corporate Institutions (2004–2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Corporate publications as % of state total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>20.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>13.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>13.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>10.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ratio of National Patent Citation Share to National Publication Share (2004–2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Ratio of patent citation share to publication share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Ratio of patent citation share to publication share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Ranking of states (1–50) along select indicators of research performance

- **A:** Number of publications, 2004–2013
- **B:** Compound annual growth rate (CAGR) in publications, 2004–2013
- **C:** Publications per 1,000 residents, 2013
- **D:** Field-weighted citation impact (FWCI), 2004–2013
- **E:** CAGR in FWCI, 2004–2013
- **F:** Publications by the academic sector per million $ USD (in 2013 dollars), 2004–2013
- **G:** Publications by the academic sector per 1,000 net assignable square feet (NASF), 2011
- **H:** Publications by the academic sector per faculty, 2013
- **I:** Ratio of national download share to national publication share, 2004–2013
- **J:** Ratio of national patent citation share to national publication share, 2004–2013

### Source
- LexisNexis® patent database and Scopus®


7. For more information on what types of records are included in our definition of peer-reviewed publications, please see Appendix B: Glossary. This is a high-level proxy for research efficiency. For a longer discussion on the limitations of this approach, please see Appendix B: Measuring Research Efficiency and Productivity.

8. This is a high-level proxy for research efficiency. For a longer discussion on the limitations of this approach, please see Appendix B: Measuring Research Efficiency and Productivity. For more information on how we classify research output into the corporate, government, and other sectors, please see Appendix C: Glossary.


11. According to the US Bureau of Labor Statistics (http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_ar.htm) occupational employment surveys (OES), the location quotient for farming, fishing, and forestry occupations in Arkansas in 2013 was 1.44. This means that the relative percentage of workers in that occupation in Arkansas was 44% than the relative percentage of workers in that occupation throughout the US. More in-depth studies of research space usage and efficiency can normalize for these distortions. See Appendix B: Measuring Research Efficiency and Productivity for more details.


13. This organization is based on based on Klavans and Boyack’s uni-dimensional map of science. As a general rule, adjacent subject areas (such as computer science and mathematics, or energy and environmental science) are “closer” to one another in terms of cross-disciplinary collaboration and epistemic overlap. See Klavans, R., & Boyack, K. W. (2009). Toward a Consensus Map of Science. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 60(12), 2431–2441. doi:10.1002/asi.21491

14. In this and subsequent figures, names are shortened for ease of view. For full lists of names and fields, please see Appendix D: Scopus 27 Subject Classification.


17. For a full list of research fields and how research publications are categorized into fields, please see Appendix D: Field Classification Systems.

18. See http://report.nih.gov/nihdatabook/index.aspx. For more information on what types of records are included in our definition of peer-reviewed publications, please see Appendix B: Glossary.


20. This is a high-level proxy for research efficiency. For a longer discussion on the limitations of this approach, please see Appendix B: Measuring Research Efficiency and Productivity.

21. This is a high-level proxy for research efficiency. For a longer discussion on the limitations of this approach, please see Appendix B: Measuring Research Efficiency and Productivity.

22. It is important to note, however, that different fields of research have different space requirements – for example, research in the biological and biomedical sciences tend to require much more space than that in the social sciences. More in-depth studies of research space usage and efficiency can normalize for these distortions. See Appendix B: Measuring Research Efficiency and Productivity for more details.

23. According to the US Bureau of Labor Statistics (http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_ar.htm) occupational employment surveys (OES), the location quotient for farming, fishing, and forestry occupations in Arkansas in 2013 was 1.44. This means that the relative percentage of workers in that occupation in Arkansas was 44% than the relative percentage of workers in that occupation throughout the US. More in-depth studies of research space usage and efficiency can normalize for these distortions. See Appendix B: Measuring Research Efficiency and Productivity for more details.

24. Please see Appendix B:Measuring Research Efficiency and Productivity for a longer discussion on limitations of this measure.
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