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Abstract
A recent review in F1000Research identified the "top research priorities identified in leading publications" at the interface of Aging and Energetics. The authors identified the ten most-cited papers in each of the years 2010 through 2013, and used these forty papers to identify thematic categories. However, the search methodology used by the authors omitted many high-impact aging manuscripts. Minor modifications in the authors’ search methodology finds that Diabetes/insulin resistance, Sirtuins, and the Microbiome are also top thematic categories.
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Correspondence
My laboratory members and I were excited to read a recent review in F1000Research, entitled “Aging and energetics’ ‘Top 40’ future research opportunities 2010–2013”. The review discusses research opportunities in 10 fields at the intersection of aging and metabolism. The authors identified ten research categories through a Scopus search for the ten most cited papers in each of the years 2010 through 2013, for a total of 40 papers. However, upon examining the list of these papers, I was surprised to notice that a significant number of these articles were reviews, and that I recognized very few of the papers. I was also struck by the relatively low number of citations each paper had gathered, as well as by the almost complete absence of high-impact journals such as Cell, Nature, Science and PNAS from the search results.

Helpfully, the authors included their Scopus search terms in the methods section of their review, and I was easily able to replicate the results of their search. Upon consideration of the search terminology, I realized the authors had limited their results to papers in which “aging”, “lifespan” and other key search terms relating to aging and metabolism appeared in the title. I repeated their search with one important difference: I searched for keywords and did not limit my search to the title field (see Methods). My list of the 10 most cited articles from each year (2010–2013) at the intersection of aging and metabolism/energetics is given in Appendix A.

The list I generated is almost entirely different from the authors’ results, including only 3 of the 40 papers identified by Allison and colleagues. My search identified many more high impact papers (based on citation count) and a greater proportion, 18 out of 41 papers, were published by the high impact journals Cell, Nature, Science and PNAS. Whereas Allison et al. identified Morselli et al. as the original research manuscript in 2010 with the most citations (99), my methodology identified 8 papers from 2010 with a higher number of citations, the highest of which, Ng et al., had 298 citations.

I performed a rapid scoring of my resulting list against the thematic categories identified by Allison and colleagues. Interestingly, “nutrient effects beyond energy” rose to the top of this list, due in part to my inclusion of metformin-related papers in this category. A new thematic area, Diabetes/insulin resistance, was tied for second place with Mitochondria, reactive oxygen species, and cellular energetics. This was followed by another new thematic area, “Sir- tuins”, tied with “Calorie restriction”. The Microbiome was also an important new thematic area. Three categories identified by Allison et al., “use and effects of mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs)”, “accretion and effects of body fat”, and “the aging heart”, were entirely absent from my newly generated list.

In conclusion, a minor change in search methodology resulted in the retrieval of a very different list of papers than that identified by Alison and colleagues. “Calorie restriction”, “nutrient effects beyond energy”, “mTOR”, and “autophagy” are still clearly important areas for aging research. However, Diabetes/insulin resistance, Microbiome, and Sirtuins should be included in this list. The narrow search strategy employed by Allison et al. missed these important thematic areas.

Methods
I repeated the Scopus search the authors had performed, substituting the use of the “KEY” (keyword) field in place of the “TITLE” (title) field. The search performed was:

\[
((\text{KEY}((\text{aging OR ageing OR lifespan OR longevity OR senescence}))) \text{AND PUBYEAR} > 2009 \text{AND PUBYEAR < 2014}) \text{AND} ((\text{KEY}((\text{calori}^{\text{r}}\text{ OR } \text{diet}^{\text{r}}\text{ OR energetic}^{\text{r}}\text{ OR nutri}^{\text{r}}\text{ OR food OR fat OR adipo}^{\text{r}}\text{ OR body composition}))) \text{AND PUBYEAR} > 2009 \text{AND PUBYEAR < 2014}))
\]

For each search year (2010–2013), I then excluded review articles and removed self-citations using the Scopus tools, and then manually removed additional review articles and articles that did not involve biological research in the field of aging (i.e., consensus treatment guidelines, articles on children in developing countries, and material science manuscripts). Eleven manuscripts were included in 2012 due to a 10th place tie in citation count.

Thematic areas were annotated by inspection of the title and abstract only. Themes were taken from the list generated by Allison et al., and the following areas were added after inspection of the titles only: Diabetes/insulin resistance, Microbiome, and Sirtuins. Proteostasis was added to the Autophagy category, and Metformin was added to the “Nutrient effects beyond energy” category during the scoring process.
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Appendix A: Top ten most cited papers on aging and energetics using keyword field for each year between 2010 and 2013.

An alternative top 40 list to that generated by Allison et al. using the KEY field in Scopus instead of the TITLE field.

Click here to access the data.
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Lamming comments on, and presents an alternative approach to, identification of “hot topics” in aging research previously published by Allison et al. (2014). In the original paper, Allison et al. screened title to identify the 10 most cited papers from 2010 to 2013 and to suggest promising future research opportunities. Lamming was concerned about including review articles in the search, and sensed a lack of concentration of papers listed in the highest impact factor journal. By broadening the search to include title as well as key words, and excluding review articles, Lamming generated a markedly different list of top cited papers. Interestingly, distinct thematic areas (which make intuitive sense as hot topics) were identified, including diabetes/insulin resistance, sirtuins, and microbiome. Bottom line: changing search approach somewhat modestly had a major impact on list outcome.

The correspondence is interesting and the search was validly conducted. The paper makes the important point well familiar to geneticists—design of the screen has a major impact on outcome. Both search strategies have merit, and the reader who prefers not to search for her/himself now has two chances to have her/his papers or research area cited.
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The observations noted in this manuscript partially reflect the subjectiveness of this type of analysis. The results of both manuscripts describe key publications in the field that are skewed unintentionally by search terms.
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This piece by Dr. Lamming is informative and concise. The search methodology and results are well described. It should be of interest to researchers in biogerontology.
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