

Measuring real-world publication performance across therapy areas, article types, and publication enhancements

40

Hollie Rawlings,^a Lorna Blackwell,^b Clare Loane,^a Charles Pollitt^b

^aOxford PharmaGenesis, London, UK; ^bIpsen, Wrexham, UK

Presenter: Nelma Pertega-Gomes, Ipsen US



For further information, please send your question(s) to **Hollie Rawlings** (hollie.rawlings@pharmagenesis.com).

To download the poster, please scan the Quick Response (QR) code.

Copies of this eposter obtained through the QR code are for personal use only and may not be reproduced without written permission from the authors.

Objective

- To systematically evaluate publication performance at different time points, with a view to determining benchmarks for future performance evaluation and to inform publication strategy (**Panel 1**).

Research design and methods

- All articles (N = 250) published by Ipsen between January 2022 and June 2023 were assessed based on several factors (**Panel 1**).
- Short-term reach, medium-term engagement, and long-term impact were measured (**Panel 1**).

Results

- In total, 333 metrics cards (covering 250 articles) were included and grouped by TA (oncology, neuroscience, rare disease, other) and article type (primary, secondary, SLR, non-clinical, RWE, other) (**Panel 2**).
- Primary research had the highest impact; non-clinical research had the highest reach via Facebook interactions and the highest engagement via Mendeley saves (**Panel 3**).
- SLRs had high impact despite low reach and engagement (**Panel 3**).
- Analyses across TAs showed that oncology had the highest impact but reach and engagement were broadly similar (**Panel 4**).
- Most articles did not have publication enhancements, but their inclusion may improve article reach (**Panel 5**).
- Initial analysis of PLS inclusion indicated no effect on metric scores, but in-depth analysis is required to account for factors such as indexing and PLS location (supplement vs main text) (**Panel 6**).
- The inclusion of patient author(s) may improve article reach and engagement. However, it should be noted that only five publications with patient author(s) were identified (**Panel 7**).
- Publications were not measured over a sufficiently long period to be able to identify policy, patent, and guideline citations.

Conclusions

- These analyses suggest a high benchmark for future primary research and SLRs with regard to impact.
- From a strategic perspective, our data show that building enhancements into publication planning may be worthwhile, and that SLRs could be strategically important publication types.

