Introduction

The evaluation of the scientific activity in addictive substances allows, among other indicators, having an overview of the scientific production of a particular researcher, as well as representing the top co-authorship networks and identifying the areas where the studies are concentrated (Ribeiro Schneider et al., 2014). The present study aims to analyze the top co-authorships on addictive substances and the top substance studied per researcher in the 2008-2012 period through Web of Science database.

Methods

The search was conducted through the health and social Web of Science categories from Web of Science Core Collection database. A total of 44,822 articles were found by using a specific drug abuse search strategy during the period 2008-2012 (see Melero-Fuentes, 2016).

Results

143 authors have collaborated with one or more authors in more than 19 papers. Among these, 37 authors have published more than 44 papers, 55 have published between 27 and 44 articles, and 51 authors who have published between 26 and 20 articles. The largest group consists of 21 authors, rest of 39 groups consist of between seven and two authors (Figure 1 shows seven greatest groups).

Major co-authorships are composed of specialized authors in the study of alcohol (54 authors distributed in 18 groups) and in nicotine (51 authors distributed in 13 groups). In several groups with a greater number of components that have published their greatest number of works on nicotine or alcohol there are coauthors that have mainly published in other areas such as nicotine or alcohol, or opioids and volatile solvents.

In the study of amphetamines five groups have been developed, one of them with a coauthor who has mainly published on cocaine. Other smaller groups are composed by authors who publish mainly on opioids, cannabis and cocaine.

Discussion

The most intense links show an interest in co-authoring work, favoring the formation of research groups in the study, mainly of alcohol, nicotine and amphetamines. This can be quite positive because it shows on the collaboration between authors, the strengthening of working groups and the increase in scientific communication, all them indispensable elements for the development of science (Agudelo et al., 2003).

Figure 1. Graphic representation of the greatest collaboration links between two authors (> 19 articles)*
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