 doi:10.20944/preprints202006.0299.v3

Article

A Bibliometric Analysis of COVID-19 across Science and Social Science Research Landscape

Aleksander Aristovnik *, Dejan Ravšelj and Lan Umek

Faculty of Public Administration, University of Ljubljana, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia; dejan.ravselj@fu.uni-lj.si; lan.umek@fu.uni-lj.si

* Correspondence: aleksander.aristovnik@fu.uni-lj.si

Abstract: The COVID-19 pandemic caused by the novel coronavirus emerged in Wuhan City, Hubei province of China at the end of 2019, has radically transformed the lives of people around the world. Due to its fast spreading, it is currently considered as a worldwide health, social and economic concern. The lack of knowledge on this area has encouraged academic sphere for extensive research, which is reflected in exponentially growing scientific literature in this area. However, current state of COVID-19 research reveals only early development of knowledge, while a comprehensive and in-depth overview remains neglected. Accordingly, the main aim of this paper is to fill the aforementioned gap in the literature and provide an extensive bibliometric analysis of COVID-19 research across science and social science research landscape. The bibliometric analysis is based on the Scopus database including all relevant and latest information on COVID-19 related publications (n=16,866) in the first half of 2020. The findings emphasize an importance of a comprehensive and in-depth approach considering different scientific disciplines in COVID-19 research. The understanding of the evolution of emerging scientific knowledge on COVID-19 is beneficial not only for scientific community but also for evidence-based policymaking in order to prevent and address the COVID-19 pandemic.

Keywords: COVID-19; coronavirus; pandemic; science; social science; bibliometric analysis

1. Introduction

Since 2000s, the world has witnessed two large-scale disease outbreaks. These are Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) and Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS), which emerged in 2003 and 2012, respectively, and caused a worldwide pandemic that claimed thousands of human lives [1]. In December 2019, a new strain of coronavirus (COVID-19), not previously identified in humans, has emerged in Wuhan City, Hubei province of China. The virus has begun to spread exponentially across all inhabited continents and the number of cases and deaths related to COVID-19 has soon exceeded the numbers of other two coronaviruses (SARS and MERS). The outbreak of COVID-19 is a typical public health emergency. Its high infection rate makes it a huge threat to global public health [2-4]. However, its rapid spread has not only affected the lives of many people around the world, but also disrupted the pattern of social and economic development, leading to incalculable social and economic losses [5]. In about last 6 months, more than 13.7 million cases and almost 600,000 deaths have been seen at the global level [6]. International institutions have therefore announced the global economy is now in a recession – as bad or worse than in the global financial crisis of 2009, arguing this recession will affect both developed and developing countries [7,8]. Therefore, it is not surprising, why the COVID-19 pandemic has attracted the attention of the academic sphere and spurred a new wave of research in this area.

The recent bibliometric studies considering broader aspect of coronavirus research over time emphasize that pandemics represent a major medical issue and provide some interesting findings. Taking into account previous coronavirus pandemics Hu et al. [9] establish that the highest research

 doi:10.20944/preprints202006.0299.v3

interest occur in the first year after outburst. This is further confirmed by the study addressing coronavirus research trends during the last 20-years [10,11] and last 50-years period [12, 13]. However, although the growth pattern was not uniform, China and the United States have played a major role in the contribution of coronavirus research [14]. Therefore, it is not surprising why recently COVID-19 has become the central topic in the recent scientific literature, since the research addressing various aspects of COVID-19 may be the key to mitigating the current COVID-19 pandemic as well as their consequences [15,16]. The current high-growing interest in COVID-19 and related coronaviruses has even led to the creation of so called COVID-19 Open Research Dataset (CORD-19) covering over 158,000 scholarly articles, including over 75,000 with full text in order to provide a solid basis for generating new insights in support of the ongoing fight against COVID-19 [17]. The overview of CORD-19 publications reveals that publications are mostly focused on a few and well-defined areas, including coronaviruses (primarily SARS, MERS and COVID-19), public health and viral epidemics, the molecular biology of viruses, influenza and other families of viruses, immunology and antivirals as well as methodology (testing, diagnosing and clinical trials). However, the review of latest CORD-19 publications from 2020 indicates a shift from health to other relevant scientific disciplines [18].

In the literature, there exist also several recent bibliographic studies, which are focusing only on COVID-19 research. They reveal that China and the United States have the largest COVID-19 scientific production [19-23]. The most relevant institutions involved in COVID-19 research are Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan University and University of Hong Kong. Moreover, the majority of published documents on COVID-19 are published in prestigious journals with high impact factors, including the Lancet, BMJ – Clinical Research Ed. and Journal of Medical Virology [19,23]. Furthermore, according to the number of publications, the most influential authors in COVID-19 research are Huang, C., Zhu, N. and Chan, J.F. [21]. Finally, it is also established that virology, epidemiology, clinical features, laboratory examination, radiography, diagnosis and treatment are the current research hotspots of COVID-19 [21,22].

Although, the absence of knowledge on the novel COVID-19 has grabbed the attention of the academic sphere, spurring a new wave of research into the virus [24], yet, the vast majority of recent studies chiefly consider health-related issues, leaving other aspects neglected, as indicated by the latest literature [19-23]. Moreover, COVID-19 research's current status is only of the early development of knowledge. Therefore, the literature stresses that greater research should be conducted in less-explored areas, including life, physical and social sciences [21]. Accordingly, the main aim of this paper is to provide an extensive bibliometric analysis on COVID-19 research in first five months of 2020. Although there already exist several papers addressing bibliometric analysis of COVID-19 research, several research gaps are identified, which are carefully tackled by this paper. First, the existing bibliometric studies are predominantly focused on general analysis of COVID-19 research, showing the importance of health sciences in this area, while detailed insight considering different research landscapes remain neglected. Therefore, this paper provides in-depth bibliometric analysis by considering various science and social science research landscapes. Second, the predominant part of the research are mostly addressing databases containing document information only. Accordingly, this paper extends the analysis on a comprehensive database including document and source information, allowing the bibliometric analysis in different research landscapes. Finally, recent research is neglecting the fact that scientific disciplines intertwine strongly with each other. Therefore, this paper provides an innovative approach, allowing showing all possible logical relations between different research landscapes.

Thus, the main aim of this paper is to provide an unprecedented, comprehensive and in-depth examination of COVID-19 research across different research landscapes, which can suggest important guidelines for researchers about the avenues for future research. The remaining sections of this paper are structured as follows. The second section presents materials and methods. In the third section, the results are discussed. The paper ends with conclusion, where main findings are summarized.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202006.0299.v3

2. Materials and Methods

A comprehensive bibliometric data on COVID-19 related research is obtained throughout two consecutive phases. The first phase involves identification of all relevant documents or publications from January 1, 2020 to July 1, 2020 in the Scopus database on document information, which is widely recognised database also by the previous research [9,13,19,23]. The applied search query extends previously narrowly defined queries [21,22] by including a wide range of COVID-19 related keywords: "novel coronavirus 2019", "coronavirus 2019", "COVID 2019", "COVID19", "COVID 19", "COVID-19", "SARS-CoV-2", "HCoV-19", "2019-nCoV" and "severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2". The keyword search was set to include titles, abstract and keywords. Additionally, the search period was set to include documents published between January 1, 2020 and July 1, 2020. Finally, only documents in English language were considered for the review process. According to the presented search query, a total of 21.400 documents are identified as relevant in COVID-19 research. Interestingly, the number of documents obtained by using identical search query increased for 60%, as on June 1, 2020 the same search resulted to 13,480 documents. This implies that interest COVID-19 research is growing exponentially. The second phase involves supplementing the presented Scopus database on document information with Scopus CiteScore metrics containing source related information (e.g. citations, rankings, SNIP, etc.). The process of obtaining and merging the relevant data is facilitated by Python programming language. The merging process revealed that some of the documents from Scopus had no match in Scopus CiteScore metrics (n=4,534), meaning that they are not considered in the bibliometric analysis. Accordingly, the screening process resulted in a unique database of 16,866 documents.

Then, an in-depth bibliometric analysis followed, allowing for an innovative approach to literature review. Namely, the structured literature review represents a traditional approach to analyse and review scientific literature, providing an in-depth overview of the content. However, this approach suffers from several limitations related to subjective factors, time-consumption and efficiency. The application of modern bibliometric approaches reduces the aforementioned limitations and provide an effective way to handle extensive collections of scientific literature [25]. So far, the existing bibliometric studies have been hardly neglecting the fact that scientific disciplines are strongly intertwined, resulting in similar findings and conclusions in these studies and lack of knowledge in less-explored areas [21]. Therefore, an innovative quantitative bibliometric analysis, including Venn diagram and keyword-co-occurrence network, is conducted to supplement the existing research and assess the state of current COVID-19 research across different research landscapes (health sciences, life sciences, physical sciences and social sciences & humanities) by innovative statistical approaches using Python programming language and software bibliometric tools such as Biblioshiny and VOSviewer.

3. Results

An overview of scientific documents utilised in this study is presented in Table 1. A total of 16,866 documents written by 66,504 different authors and published in 2,548 journals were utilised in this study, whereby 7,422 (44%) of them have at least one citation in the Scopus database providing a total of 100,683 citations. For these documents, the average citations per document were 13.57 and the average authors per document were 3.94. A major proportion of the documents were articles (41%) and letters (26%). Much smaller proportion of the documents were reviews (10%), editorials (10%) and notes (9%). Finally, there was a negligible proportion of other documents (2%) such as short surveys, conference papers, erratums and data papers. The presented characteristics of scientific documents on COVID-19 research are predominantly in line with previous research [20,21].

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 20 July 2020 doi:10.20944/preprints202006.0299.v3

Table 1. Overview of scientific documents on COVID-19 research (January-June 2020).

Database summary	Findings
Bibliometric items	**Number**
Total documents	16,866
Total authors	66,504
Total journals	2,548
Total citations	100,683
Cited documents	7,422
Average citations	13.57
Average authors	3.94
Document type	**Number (share)**
Article	6,998 (41%)
Letter	4,467 (26%)
Review	1,713 (10%)
Editorial	1,698 (10%)
Note	1,593 (9%)
Other	397 (2%)

Source: Authors' elaboration based on Scopus database, July 2020.

Table 2 presents most relevant (top 20) journals in COVID-19 research by number of documents. They contain almost one-fifth (18%) of total documents and cover a significant share (41%) of total citations. Most of them are ranked into the first quartile (Q1) and have a relatively high source normalized impact per paper (SNIP), which is in line with the existing research [19,23]. Moreover, the majority of these journals are subject to health sciences and they are classified predominantly in the following sub-subject areas or fields: infectious diseases, general medicine and microbiology (medical). Finally, most of these journals are from Anglo-Saxon countries such as the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and the United States. Similar findings are provided also by previous COVID-19 bibliometric studies [21,22]. However, all of the existing bibliometric studies are neglecting the fact that sciences are strongly intertwined, leading to a lack of understanding of the COVID-19 research in other scientific disciplines [21].

Table 2. Most relevant journals in COVID-19 research (January-June 2020).

Source title	Number of documents	Number of citations	Sub-subject area (ranking) 2019	SNIP 2019	Country
Journal of Medical Virology	293	3,657	Virology (37/66, Q3) Infectious Diseases (108/283, Q2)	0.780	US
The BMJ	261	1,358	General Medicine (21/529, Q1)	3.999	UK
The Lancet	239	13,755	General Medicine (1/529, Q1)	21.313	UK
Medical Hypotheses	227	107	General Medicine (99/529, Q1)	0.509	US
Science of the Total Environment	174	948	Environmental Engineering (10/132, Q1) Pollution (13/120, Q1) Waste Management and Disposal (10/100, Q1) Environmental Chemistry (17/115, Q1)	1.977	NL
International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health	155	490	Public Health, Environmental and Occupational Health (174/516, Q2) Health, Toxicology and Mutagenesis (68/128, Q3) Pollution (58/120, Q2)	1.248	CH
Journal of Infection	155	1,049	Microbiology (medical) (13/115, Q1) Infectious Diseases (21/238, Q1)	1.587	UK

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 20 July 2020 doi:10.20944/preprints202006.0299.v3

International Journal of Infectious Diseases	148	1,503	Microbiology (medical) (26/115, Q1) Infectious Diseases (59/283, Q1)	1.426	NL
Psychiatry Research	130	314	Psychiatry and Mental Health (154/506, Q2) Biological Psychiatry (25/38, Q3)	0.968	IE
Journal of Clinical Virology	120	239	Virology (19/66, Q2) Infectious Diseases (44/283, Q1)	1.238	NL
Diabetes and Metabolic Syndrome: Clinical Research and Reviews	119	462	Internal Medicine (75/128, Q3) Endocrinology, Diabetes and Metabolism (135/217, Q3)	0.982	NL
Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology	118	172	Microbiology (medical) (39/115, Q2) Epidemiology (40/93, Q2) Infectious Diseases (91/283, Q2)	1.358	UK
Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease	113	621	Public Health, Environmental and Occupational Health (73/516, Q1) Infectious Diseases (82/283, Q2)	1.184	NL
Critical Care	112	244	Critical Care and Intensive Care Medicine (4/81, Q1)	2.508	UK
The Lancet Infectious Diseases	111	2,280	Infectious Diseases (4/283, Q1)	7.234	UK
New England Journal of Medicine	106	11,768	General Medicine (2/529, Q1)	13.212	US
Asian Journal of Psychiatry	101	433	Psychiatry and Mental Health (217/506, Q2) General Psychology (71/204, Q2)	1.022	NL
Dermatologic Therapy	100	153	Dermatology (74/123, Q3)	0.883	UK
Chaos, Solitons and Fractals	97	132	Applied Mathematics (25/510, Q1) General Mathematics (9/368, Q1) General Physics and Astronomy (27/224, Q1) Statistical and Nonlinear Physics (4/44, Q1)	1.380	UK
Science	97	1,918	Multidisciplinary (2/111, Q1)	7.521	US

Source: Authors' elaboration based on Scopus database, July 2020.

According to the Scopus classification, documents can be classified into four different subject areas, namely: health sciences, life sciences, physical sciences and social sciences & humanities. However, these subject areas are strongly intertwined meaning that individual document can be classified in several subject areas at the same time. Accordingly, for the purposes of addressing the comprehensiveness of COVID-19 research, Figure 1 shows the Venn diagram of the presented subject areas and all the possible sets that can be made from them. This also makes it possible to determine the so-called pure sciences, covering only those documents belonging exclusively to just one subject area (without intersecting with other subject areas). According to the number of documents obtained on July 1, 2020 (June 1, 2020), health sciences contain a total of 14,187 (8,896) documents of which 10,394 (6,575) documents are identified as pure health sciences. Further, life sciences encompass a total of 4,143 (2,549) documents of which 928 (599) documents are considered as pure life sciences. Moreover, physical sciences include a total of 1,625 (878) documents of which 568 (314) documents belongs to pure physical sciences. Finally, social sciences & humanities cover a total of 1,812 (977) documents of which 771 (323) are determined as pure social sciences & humanities. A comparison between different subject areas reveals that health sciences are the most relevant in COVID-19

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 20 July 2020 doi:10.20944/preprints202006.0299.v3

research, while the second most relevant subject area is represented by life sciences. Moreover, physical sciences and social sciences & humanities seem to be the least popular so far. However, in the last month (June 2020) social sciences seem to be the most growing scientific discipline, as the total number of documents in this subject area increased by 85% and even by 139% in pure social sciences. This is consistent with the expectations. Namely, the first immediate response to COVID-19 pandemic is the protection of public health, while the real socio-economic consequences occur later. This path is also revealed by the recent scientific literature on COVID-19 published in the first half of 2020. Finally, some of the documents (273) are considered as multidisciplinary, making impossible to include them in the further bibliometric analysis.



Figure 1. Venn diagram on COVID-19 research across different subject areas (January-June 2020). Source: Authors' elaboration based on Scopus database (all documents included), July 2020.

Figure 2 presents most relevant countries of COVID-19 research by subject area. It shows the top 5 countries, providing the largest number of documents of corresponding author. The most relevant country is the United States, significantly dominating in all scientific disciplines, except in physical sciences, where it is ranked on the second place. In addition to the United States, which significantly outperform other countries, also China and Italy dominate in COVID-19 research as they are among top 3 countries in all scientific disciplines, except in social sciences, where Italy is replaced by India. These findings are consistent with the existing bibliometric studies (which do not consider scientific disciplines separately), arguing that the United States and China have world-leading position in COVID-19 research [19-23].

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 20 July 2020 doi:10.20944/preprints202006.0299.v3



Figure 2. Most relevant countries of COVID-19 research by subject area (January-June 2020). Source: Authors' elaboration based on Scopus database (only documents with at least one citation included), July 2020.

Figure 3 shows most relevant institutions in COVID-19 research by subject area. Due to the strong intertwining between individual scientific disciplines, they to some extent can share the same most relevant institutions. The most involved institution is Huazhong University of Science and Technology, providing a significantly higher number of documents in health sciences (n=1,380) and life sciences (n=420). Besides, Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University and Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai also play an important role in these two scientific disciplines. Moreover, Fudan University is dominating in physical sciences (n=68), while providing an enviable number of publications also in life sciences (n=155). Finally, California Department of Public Health and Public Health – Seattle and King County are the most relevant institutions in social sciences & humanities, having an important role also in physical sciences.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 20 July 2020 doi:10.20944/preprints202006.0299.v3



Figure 3. Most relevant institutions in COVID-19 research by subject area (January-June 2020). Source: Authors' elaboration based on Scopus database (only documents with at least one citation included), July 2020.

Figure 4 presents the most relevant journals in COVID-19 research by subject area. In health sciences, Journal of Medical Virology has the most documents (n=293), which is followed by the BMJ (n=261), the Lancet (n=239), Medical Hypotheses (n=227), International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health (n=155). These findings are to some extend with previous COVID-19 bibliometric research not distinguishing between individual scientific disciplines [19,23]. As far as other scientific disciplines are concerned, the results reveal the following. For life sciences, due to strong interweaving with health sciences, the most relevant journal is also Journal of Medical Virology, having the most documents (n=293), which is followed by Psychiatry Research (n=130), Journal of Clinical Virology (n=120), Brain, Behaviour and Immunity (n=77) and Pharmacological Research (n=63). In physical sciences, the most relevant journals are Science of the Total Environment (n=174), followed by International Journal of Environmental Research (n=155), Chaos, Solitons and Fractals (n=97), Journal of Diabetes Science and Technology (n=47) and International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology (n=41). Finally, for social sciences & humanities the most relevant journals are Asian Journal of Psychiatry (n=101), followed by Economic and Political Weekly (n=84), Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy (n=62), Social Anthropology (n=45) and AIDS and Behavior (n=44).

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 20 July 2020 doi:10.20944/preprints202006.0299.v3



Figure 4. Most relevant journals in COVID-19 research by subject area (January-June 2020).
Source: Authors' elaboration based on Scopus database (all documents included), July 2020.

Figure 5 shows most relevant authors in COVID-19 research by subject area. According to the number of total citations it is evident that Wang, Y. (China-Japan Friendship Hospital, Beijing, China) and Li, X. (Clinical and Research Centre of Infectious Diseases, Beijing, China) are the most important authors involved in COVID-19 research as they are among top 5 cited authors in all four scientific disciplines. This finding is different according to the existing bibliometric studies, presumably due to different criteria applied [21].



Figure 5. Most relevant authors in COVID-19 research by subject area (January-June 2020).
Source: Authors' elaboration based on Scopus database (total citations included), July 2020.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 20 July 2020 doi:10.20944/preprints202006.0299.v3

Figure 6 presents the keyword co-occurrence network for (a) health sciences, (b) life sciences, (c) physical sciences and (d) social sciences & humanities separately. In order to ensure greater distinction between individual subject areas, only pure sciences (without intersecting with other sciences) are considered in the bibliometric analysis. Moreover, the bibliometric analysis is conducted on 100 most frequent (author and index) keywords by considering exclusion of the keywords used in the search query, elimination of stop words, and consolidation of the keywords describing the same phenomenon.



(a) Health Sciences (b) Life Sciences

(c) Physical Sciences (d) Social Sciences & Humanities

Figure 6. Keyword co-occurrence network in COVID-19 research by subject area (January-June 2020). Source: Authors' elaboration based on Scopus database, July 2020.

The bibliometric analysis reveals that research hotspots differ according to subject area. For health sciences, 3 clusters are identified, addressing the following topics: 1) pandemics; 2) risk factors and symptoms: and 3) mortality. Accordingly, health sciences deal predominantly with health related issues related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Next, in the life sciences, 3 clusters are found, which are dealing with: 1) pandemics; 2) virology; and 3) drug efficiency. The focus of life sciences seem to be more oriented towards the knowledge about spreading of the virus and ways how to prevent efficiently the disease with appropriate drugs. This corresponds to the findings from other recent bibliometric studies on COVID-19 research, emphasizing predominantly health related issues [21,22]. As regards physical sciences, 3 clusters are recognised, which are related to: 1) pandemics; 2) China and disease transmission and 3) air pollution. Physical sciences are focused on knowledge related to how fast the COVID-19 pandemic is spreading and environmental related issues. Finally, in social sciences & humanities, 6 clusters are identified, addressing the following topics: 1) pandemics; 2) epidemics; 3) viral disease and China; 4) respiratory disease; 5) social distancing; and 6) mental health. The detailed synopsis of the research hotspots, including top 10 keywords, related to COVID-19 in individual scientific discipline is presented in Table 3.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 20 July 2020 doi:10.20944/preprints202006.0299.v3

Table 3. Research hotspots and keywords related to COVID-19 across different subject areas (January-June 2020).

Subject area	Research hotspots	Keywords
Health Sciences	Pandemics	Humans, Pandemics, Pneumonia, Epidemic, China, Infection Control, Virus Transmission, Health Care Personnel, Procedures, Practice Guideline
	Risk Factors and Symptoms	Female, Male, Adult, Fever, Middle Aged, Aged, Clinical Article, Coughing, Case Report, Computer Assisted Tomography
	Mortality	Nonhuman, Disease Severity, Virology, Complication, Risk Factor, Intensive Care Unit, Mortality, Mortality Rate, Hospitalization, Comorbidity
Life Sciences	Pandemics	Humans, Pandemics, Pneumonia, China, Epidemic, Virus Transmission, Disease Severity, Female, Male, Adult
	Virology	Nonhuman, Angiotensin Converting Enzyme 2, Virology, Genetics, Controlled Study, Animals, Animal, Drug Effect, Physiology, Metabolism
	Drug Efficiency	Unclassified Drug, Antivirus Agent, Remdesivir, Hydroxychloroquine, Antiviral Activity, Antiviral Agents, Virus Genome, Drug Efficacy, Chloroquine, Lopinavir Plus Ritonavir
Physical Sciences	Pandemics	Pandemics, humans, pneumonia, virus, viral disease, diseases, epidemic, respiratory disease, epidemiology, disease transmission
	China and Disease Transmission	China, infectious diseases, transmissions, temperature, humidity, Italy, environmental temperature, population statistics, major clinical study, air temperature
	Air Pollution	Air Quality, Air Pollution, Particulate Matter, Nitrogen Dioxide, Concentration (Composition), Nitrogen Oxides, Quarantine, Atmospheric Pollution, City, Environmental Monitoring
Social Sciences & Humanities	Pandemics	Pandemics, Crisis, Resilience, Inequality, Lockdown, India, Tourism, Globalization, Learning, Teaching
	Epidemics	Epidemic, Human Resource Management, Analytics, Critical Care, Differential Equations, Discrete Time Markov Chains, Forecasting, Forecasting Models, Hubei Province, Intensive Care Units
	Viral Disease and China	Viral Disease, China, Public Health, Infectious Diseases, Virus, Disease Spread, Australia, Disease Control, Migration, South Korea
	Respiratory Disease	Respiratory Disease, Health Care, Health Care Personnel, Health Equity, Supply Chain Management, Vulnerability, Disease, Predisposition, Government, Health Care Availability, Health Care Planning
	Social Distancing*	Social Distancing, Consumer Behaviour, Social Media, Digital Technology, Health Care Workers
	Mental Health	Mental Health, Humans, Pneumonia, Trauma, Psychology, PTSD, Anxiety, Female, Male, Stress

Note: *Only 5 keywords are identified for this cluster.

Source: Authors' elaboration based on Scopus database, July 2020.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

The outbreak of COVID-19 is a typical public health emergency, which due to its high infection rate makes it a huge threat not only to global public health but also to economic and social development. In order to be able to solve such kind of emergencies, it is necessary to fully understand the problem, its implications for different areas as well as the solutions that may be effective and efficient in addressing potential devastating consequences. Therefore, the scientific knowledge on COVID-19 is very important as it facilitates answering real-life questions. However, the extent of the current COVID-19 pandemic calls for in-depth knowledge allowing identification of numerous issues in different areas. Therefore, it is not surprising, why there is an unprecedented increase in the COVID-19 research since the pandemic started [24,26]. The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in generation of large amount of scientific publications, which can consequently present potential

 doi:10.20944/preprints202006.0299.v3

problems regarding the information velocity, availability, and scientific collaboration, especially in the early stages of the pandemic [27]. The current state of COVID-19 research, therefore, needs a comprehensive analysis to help guide an agenda for further research, especially from the perspective of cooperation between different scientific disciplines in different stages of pandemic prevention and control, by applying innovative scientific approaches [28,29].

Accordingly, this paper provides an extensive bibliometric analysis of COVID-19 research across science and social science research landscape by considering main subject areas and their relationships with one another. The results show that a total of 21.400 documents related to COVID-19 research were published in Scopus database in the first half of 2020. Interestingly, the number of the documents has increased by 60% in last month (June 2020), suggesting exponential interest in COVID-19 research. The database suitable for the review process includes a total of 16,866 documents. They were written by 66,504 different authors, published in different 2,548 journals and together provide a total of 100,683 citations. A major proportion of the documents were articles (41%) and letters (26%), which is in line with previous bibliometric studies [20,21]. Moreover, the most relevant journals in COVID-19 research cover a significant share (41%) of total citations. Most of them are ranked into the first quartile (Q1) and have a relatively high source normalized impact per paper (SNIP), which is in line with the existing research [19,23]. Predominantly, they are subject to health sciences, as indicated by previous research [30], covering the sub-subject areas or fields of infectious diseases, general medicine and microbiology (medical). Finally, most of these journals are from Anglo-Saxon countries such as the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and the United States, which confirm the findings of previous bibliometric studies [21,22].

A more detailed comparison between four scientific disciplines reveals that subject areas are strongly intertwined, which calls for an in-depth analysis of individual subject area separately. According to the number of documents health science is the most relevant subject area in COVID-19 research, the second most relevant subject area is life sciences, while physical sciences and social sciences & humanities seem to be the least popular so far. However, in the last month (June 2020) social sciences seem to be the most growing scientific discipline, as the total number of documents in this subject area increased by 85% and even by 139% in pure social sciences. Moreover, the results suggest that the United States significantly dominates in all scientific disciplines, except in physical sciences. Besides the United States, which significantly outperform other countries, also China and Italy dominate in COVID-19 research. As regards the most relevant institutions, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University and Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai play an important role in health sciences and life sciences. Moreover, Fudan University is dominating in physical sciences, while having a crucial role also in life sciences. Finally, California Department of Public Health and Public Health – Seattle and King County are the most relevant institutions in social sciences & humanities, while having an important role also in physical sciences. The results regarding journals reveal that Journal of Medical Virology is the most relevant journal for health sciences and life sciences, Science of the Total Environment for physical sciences and Asian Journal of Psychiatry for social sciences & humanities. As regards most important authors, Wang, Y. (China-Japan Friendship Hospital, Beijing, China) and Li, X. (Clinical and Research Center of Infectious Diseases, Beijing, China) are the most important authors involved in COVID-19 research. Finally, the results of keyword co-occurrence analysis by main subject areas reveal different research hotspots for individual scientific disciplines, with a common point of pandemics. Health sciences are more focused on health consequences, while life sciences are more oriented towards drug efficiency. Finally, physical sciences are more focused on environmental consequences, while social sciences are more oriented towards socio-economic consequences.

The paper highlights the importance of a comprehensive and in-depth approach considering different scientific disciplines in COVID-19 research. In order to address the health and socio-economic consequences of the current COVID-19 pandemic, COVID-19 must become the focus of the research in the near future. Namely, the understanding of the evolution of emerging scientific knowledge on COVID-19 is beneficial not only for scientific community but also for evidence-based policymaking in order to prevent and address the COVID-19 pandemic.

Author Contributions: A.A. supervised the work on the paper and revised it. D.R. wrote the paper. L.U. performed analysis. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgments: The authors acknowledge the financial support from the Slovenian Research Agency (research core funding No. P5-0093).

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1 Fan, Y.; Zhao, K.; Shi, Z.L.; Zhou, P. Bat Coronaviruses in China. *Viruses* **2019**, *11*, 210, doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/v11030210.

2 Bogoch, I.I.; Watts, A.; Thomas-Bachli, A.; Huber, C.; Kraemer, M.U.; Khan, K. Pneumonia of unknown aetiology in Wuhan, China: potential for international spread via commercial air travel. *J. Travel Med*. **2020**, *27*, 1-3, doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/jtm/taaa008.

3 Lin, Q.; Zhao, S.; Gao, D.; Lou, Y.; Yang, S.; Musa, S.S.; Wang, M.H.; Cai, Y.; Wang, W.; Yang, L.; He, D. A conceptual model for the outbreak of Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Wuhan, China with individual reaction and governmental action. *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* **2020**, *93*, 211-216, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.02.058.

4 Wu, J.T.; Leung, K.; Leung, G.M. Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and international spread of the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. *Lancet* **2020**, *395*, 689-697, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30260-9.

5 Gao, X; Yu, J. Public governance mechanism in the prevention and control of the COVID-19: information, decision-making and execution. *J. Chin. Gov.* **2020**, *5*, 178-197, doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/23812346.2020.1744922.

6 ECDC. COVID-19 situation update worldwide, as of 17 July 2020. Available online: https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/geographical-distribution-2019-ncov-cases (accessed on 17 July 2020).

7 IMF. *World Economic Outlook, April 2020: The Great Lockdown*; IMF: Washington, USA, 2020.

8 OECD. *OECD Economic Outlook, June 2020*; OECD: Paris, France, 2020.

9 Hu, Y.; Chen, M.; Wang, Q.; Zhu, Y.; Wang, B.; Li, S.; Xu, Y.; Zhang, Y.; Liu, M.; Wang, Y.; Hu, Y. From SARS to COVID-19: A bibliometric study on emerging infectious diseases with natural language processing technologies. *Preprints* **2020**, doi: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-25354/v1.

10 Zhai, F.; Zhai, Y.; Cong, C.; Song, T.; Xiang, R.; Feng, T.; Liang, Z.; Zeng, Y.; Yang, J.; Yang, J.; Liang, J. Research Progress of Coronavirus Based on Bibliometric Analysis. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2020**, *17*, 3766, doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17113766.

11 Zhou, Y.; Chen, L. Twenty-Year Span of Global Coronavirus Research Trends: A Bibliometric Analysis. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2020**, *17*, 3082, doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17093082.

12 Herrera-Viedma, E.; López-Robles, J.R.; Guallar, J.; Cobo, M.J. Global trends in coronavirus research at the time of Covid-19: A general bibliometric approach and content analysis using SciMAT. *El Profesional de la Información* **2020**, *29*, doi: https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2020.may.22.

13 Ram, S. Coronavirus Research Trends: A 50–Year Bibliometric Assessment. *Sci. Tech. Libr.* **2020**, *39*, 210-266, doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/0194262X.2020.1742270.

14 Joshua, V.; Sivaprakasam, S. Coronavirus: Bibliometric analysis of scientific publications from 1968 to 2020. *Med. J. Islam. Repub. Iran* **2020**, *34*, 456-463, doi: https://doi.org/10.34171/mjiri.34.64.

15 Chahrour, M.; Assi, S.; Bejjani, M.; Nasrallah, A.A.; Salhab, H.; Fares, M.; Khachfe, H.H. A bibliometric analysis of Covid-19 research activity: A call for increased output. *Cureus* **2020**, 12, doi: https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.7357.

16 Tao, Z.; Zhou, S.; Yao, R.; Wen, K.; Da, W.; Meng, Y.; Yang, K.; Liu, H.; Tao, L. COVID-19 will stimulate a new coronavirus research breakthrough: a 20-year bibliometric analysis. *Ann. Transl. Med.* **2020**, 8, 528, doi: https://doi.org/10.21037/atm.2020.04.26.

17 CORD-19. COVID-19 Open Research Dataset. Available online: https://www.semanticscholar.org/cord19 (accessed on 28 June 2020).

18 Colavizza, G.; Costas, R.; Traag, V.A.; Van Eck, N.J.; Van Leeuwen, T.; Waltman, L. A scientometric overview of CORD-19. *BioRxiv* **2020**, doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.20.046144.

19 Dehghanbanadaki, H.; Seif, F.; Vahidi, Y.; Razi, F.; Hashemi, E.; Khoshmirsafa, M.; Aazami, H. Bibliometric analysis of global scientific research on Coronavirus (COVID-19). *Med. J. Islam. Repub. Iran* **2020**, *34*, 354-362, doi: https://doi.org/10.34171/mjiri.34.51.

20 Hamidah, I.; Sriyono, S.; Hudha, M.N. A Bibliometric Analysis of Covid-19 Research using VOSviewer. *Indones. J. Sci. Technol*. **2020**, *5*, 34-41, doi: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijost.v5i2.24522.

21 Hossain, M.M. Current status of global research on novel coronavirus disease (Covid-19): A bibliometric analysis and knowledge mapping. *Preprints* **2020**, doi: https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.23690.1.

22 Lou, J.; Tian, S.J.; Niu, S.M.; Kang, X.Q.; Lian, H.X.; Zhang, L.X.; Zhang, J.J. Coronavirus disease 2019: a bibliometric analysis and review. *Eur. Rev. Med. Pharmacol. Sci.* **2020**, *24*, 3411-3421, doi: https://doi.org/10.26355/eurrev_202003_20712.

23 Nasab, F.R., 2020. Bibliometric Analysis of Global Scientific Research on SARSCoV-2 (COVID-19). *Preprints* **2020**, doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.19.20038752.

24 Kambhampati, S.B., Vaishya, R.; Vaish, A. Unprecedented surge in publications related to COVID-19 in the first three months of pandemic: A bibliometric analytic report. *J Clin Orthop Trauma* **2020**, *11*, S304-S306, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcot.2020.04.030.

25 Wang, C.; Lim, M.K.; Zhao, L.; Tseng, M.L.; Chien, C.F.; Lev, B. The evolution of Omega-The International Journal of Management Science over the past 40 years: A bibliometric overview. *Omega* **2020**, *93*, 102098, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.omega.2019.08.005.

26 Darsono, D.; Rohmana, J.A.; Busro, B. Against COVID-19 Pandemic: Bibliometric Assessment of World Scholars' International Publications related to COVID-19. *Jurnal Komunikasi Ikatan Sarjana Komunikasi Indonesia* **2020**, *5*, 75-89, doi: https://doi.org/10.25008/jkiski.v5i1.356.

27 Homolak, J.; Kodvanj, I.; Virag, D. Preliminary analysis of COVID-19 academic information patterns: A call for open science in the times of closed borders. *Preprints* **2020**, doi: https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202003.0443.v1.

28 Tran, B.X.; Ha, G.H.; Nguyen, L.H.; Vu, G.T.; Hoang, M.T.; Le, H.T.; Latkin, C.A.; Ho, C.S.; Ho, R.C. Studies of Novel Coronavirus Disease 19 (COVID-19) Pandemic: A Global Analysis of Literature. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2020**, *17*, 4095, doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17114095.

29 Hossain, M.M., Sarwar, S.A., McKyer, E.L.J.; Ma, P. Applications of Artificial Intelligence Technologies in COVID-19 Research: A Bibliometric Study. *Preprints* **2020**, doi: https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202006.0161.v1.

30 Helmy, Y.A.; Fawzy, M.; Elaswad, A.; Sobieh, A.; Kenney, S.P.; Shehata, A.A. The COVID-19 Pandemic: A Comprehensive Review of Taxonomy, Genetics, Epidemiology, Diagnosis, Treatment, and Control. *J. Clin. Med.* **2020**, *9*, 1225, doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm9041225.