Scientometrics (2023) 128:2417–2418
https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-023-04688-4

CORRECTION

Correction: Exploring the clinical translation intensity of papers published by the world's top scientists in basic medicine

Dongyu Zang[1] · **Chunli Liu**[1,2]

Published online: 1 April 2023

Correction: Scientometrics
https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-023-04634-4

In the original publication of the article, Fig. 3 was incorrectly published. The correct Fig. 3 is given with this Correction.

The original article has been corrected.

The original article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-023-04634-4.

✉ Chunli Liu
liuchunliliangxu@163.com

[1] School of Health Management, China Medical University, Shenyang, China

[2] China Medical University, Shenyang, China



Fig. 3 Box plot of the APT, TS score, and Cited by Clin. distribution and average clinical translation intensity compared with that average citation at different publication ages. As Box plots shown in Fig. 3, APT, TS, and Cited by Clin. are all positively skewed. The first quantile value of the box of APT is equal to the median and the lower limit. The median of APT and TS is both smaller than the mean. Since the median, first quartile, third quartile, upper limit, and lower limit of Cited by Clin. are all 0, the box and the whisker are barely visible. And plenty of outliers from Cited by Clin. are shown. In Fig. 3, we can also compare the average APT, TS, and Cited by Clin. of papers at different publication ages in the sample and their differences with average RCR. This is a two-ordinate plot. The left ordinate is APT, TS, and Cited by Clin. and the right ordinate is RCR. If Cited by Clin. is compared with APT and TS in the same figure, APT and TS of the paper change slightly with the age of publication, which is masked by the change in Cited by Clin. Therefore, we use **a, b** to compare the differences between APT & TS and RCR, and the differences between Cited by Clin. and RCR, respectively