

Rankings for Scientist

More Than a Ranking

Jamaica's Universities and Research Institutions:

Comprehensive Analysis of 13 Universities and Institutions and 570 Scientists

AD Scientific Index 2026





Jamaica's Universities and Research Institutions: Comprehensive Analysis of 13 Universities and Institutions and 570 Scientists World Scientist and University Rankings 2026

(Total 2.626.817 scientist, 221 country, 24.555 university)

1. What is the AD Scientific Index?

Founded in 2021 by Prof. Dr. Murat Alper and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cihan Döğer, the AD Scientific Index (Alper-Döğer Scientific Index), with its open, reproducible, and robust methodology, is not only a comprehensive ranking system but also an academic decision-support platform that delivers practical and strategic insights by evaluating institutions from every academic angle. Unlike systems that rely on closed databases and non-reproducible indicators, the AD Scientific Index assesses academic performance at both individual and institutional levels using multidimensional, transparent, and verifiable data. In addition, through the SMART Institutional Excellence Plan, it provides institutions with innovative tools for continuous development and academic success.

Built on the principles of inclusivity, fairness, equal opportunity, and accountability, the system currently analyzes the data of 2.626.817 scientists and 24.555 institutions from 221 countries across 13 main fields and 211 disciplines. By evaluating the h-index, i10-index, and citation counts for both career-total (Career Impact) and the last five years (Recent Impact), it simultaneously measures scientists' long-term academic contributions and their current research momentum.

Aligned with the **DORA Declaration, the Leiden Manifesto, and the recent open science vision embraced by leading universities**, the AD Scientific Index adopts **transparency, reproducibility, and inclusivity** as its core principles. With its **researcher-centered**, **field-sensitive, and data-driven model**, it provides universities and policymakers with **real-time analytics**, **reliable benchmarking opportunities, and new global ranking categories** that reflect the true multidimensional impact of science. Rather than reducing universities to a single composite score, the AD Scientific Index highlights disciplinary diversity and academic contributions across fields, making unique strengths visible.

2. Fair, Focused, and Field-Based: The AD Scientific Index Approach

Most international university rankings assess research productivity, impact, educational quality, faculty strength, and per-capita performance. However, these methods often:

- Differ in data sources (SCIE, SSCI, InCites, etc.).
- Vary in publication types counted (articles, notes, conference papers, etc.).
- Emphasize select high-impact journals (Nature, Science, PNAS, etc.).
- Reuse the same indicators multiple times, creating "indicator alignment" bias.
- Cover only 1,500–3,000 institutions and 70–100 countries.

How the AD Scientific Index Differs:

- Measures both career-total (Career Impact) and last 5 years' (Recent Impact) performance (H-index, i10-index, citations) to capture legacy and current momentum.
- Ranks individual scientists, academic fields, institutions, and countries using a transparent, data-driven approach.
- Offers broad coverage by country, region, institution, discipline, language, and publication type.
- Uses no non-public or hidden parameters in ranking formulas.

3. Alignment with Research Assessment Reform

Global initiatives such as **CoARA**, **DORA**, **the Leiden Manifesto**, **and ARRA** emphasize the need for transparent, fair, and context-aware evaluation, moving beyond prestige-driven and closed-data systems. In line with these reforms and the calls from the European Commission, the **AD Scientific Index deliberately avoids one-dimensional assessment** and instead offers a **transparent**, **inclusive**, **and data-driven model** that reflects the diversity and multidimensional impact of academic performance — without reducing institutions to a single composite score.

Core Principles Applied by AD Scientific Index:

- 100% verifiable, researcher-level data; no surveys or impact factors.
- Field-sensitive evaluation to ensure fair cross-disciplinary comparisons.

- No composite scores or hidden weightings rankings are built from measurable performance data.
- Inclusive coverage of 24.555 institutions in 221 countries.
- Ethical safeguards preventing distortions such as citation cartels excessive self-citation, and honorary authorship.
- Reliable data maintained via 20–25 day update cycles and transparent corrections.

4. What Are the H-index, i10-index, and Citation Count?

H-index: The H-index is defined as the largest number h such that h publications have each received at least h citations. This metric reflects both the researcher's productivity and the sustained impact of their scientific work. **The 'recent' version of the H-index** considers publications that received at least h new citations in the last 5 years.

i10-index: The i10-index counts the number of publications with at least 10 citations. It highlights the number of works that have reached a moderate level of academic impact and reflects the breadth of a researcher's scholarly contributions. **The 'recent' version of the i10-index** refers to the number of publications that have received at least 10 new citations in the last 5 years.

Citation Count: This metric represents the total number of citations received by all of a researcher's publications. It provides an overall view of the visibility and cumulative influence of their scientific output. **The 'recent' version of citation count** refers to the number of new citations in the last 5 years to all publications.

The Significance of These Metrics for Academic Performance

These metrics provide a multidimensional evaluation of academic success:

- The **H-index** demonstrates effective and sustained scholarly performance.
- The **i10-index** measures the number of works that have surpassed a certain citation threshold, indicating the breadth of academic impact.
- The **total citation count** reflects the extent to which a researcher's work is followed, referenced, and utilized in the scientific community.

Higher values in these metrics typically indicate a stronger, broader, and more enduring academic influence. These metrics are based on data obtained from publicly available **Google Scholar** profiles. Google Scholar enables meaningful and comparable analyses across disciplines and countries, thanks to its broad coverage and open access model.

5. Balancing Legacy and Momentum: The Dual-Timeframe Model

The AD Scientific Index balances academic legacy with current research momentum by measuring H-index, i10-index, and citation counts for both career-total (Career Impact) and the last 5 years (Recent Impact), producing six distinct data points per scientist.

This approach ensures:

- Long-term contributions and recent productivity are equally visible.
- Rising researchers are highlighted while declining activity is identifiable.
- Institutions building current momentum are distinguished from those relying solely on past reputations.

(For the institutional-level application of this model, see Section 6.3.)

6. Distinctive Advantages and Unique Features

• The AD Scientific Index is a transparent, researcher-centered, and field-sensitive alternative to traditional global rankings. It relies entirely on six publicly verifiable indicators (H-index, i10-index, citations — total and last 5 years) without hidden weightings or reputation surveys.

Key Strengths:

- Dual-timeframe model captures both past achievements and current momentum.
- Researcher-to-institution ranking institutional success reflects actual member performance.
- Global inclusivity covers 221 countries, 24,538 institutions, 13 main fields, and 211 sub-disciplines.
- Real-time relevance data updated every ~20 days, rankings refreshed every 2-3 days.
- Ethical oversight triple safeguard via AI detection, community reporting, and

manual auditing.

Disciplinary fairness and field-adaptive evaluation — ensures equal visibility for STEM and non-STEM fields. This inclusivity, supported by Google Scholar's broad coverage of books, theses, reports, conference proceedings, and non-English publications, underpins the subject-specific and interdisciplinary evaluations detailed in Section 12.

6.1 Transparency, Simplicity, and Real-Time Accuracy

Impact: Ensures that all evaluation processes are clear, verifiable, and up-to-date.

- Public formulas and data sources enable independent verification.
- Near real-time updates: profiles updated ~every 20 days, rankings refreshed every 2 days.
- Rigorous data integrity maintained via cleaning processes, Al-assisted anomaly detection, and community feedback.

6.2 Researcher-First, Bottom-Up Institutional Rankings

Impact: Links institutional rankings directly to the achievements of their members.

- Rankings start from individual evaluations, then aggregate to the institutional level via percentile distribution.
- Avoids abstract prestige metrics disconnected from actual output.

6.3 Dual-Timeframe Evaluation: Balancing Legacy and Momentum

Impact: Enables fair comparisons across career stages and disciplines.

- Measures all metrics for both career-total and last 5 years.
- Highlights active excellence, differentiating sustained productivity from reliance on historical reputation.

6.4 Inclusive and Field-Sensitive Coverage

Impact: Guarantees equitable representation across all scientific fields.

- Covers underrepresented disciplines such as Social Sciences, Arts, and Humanities.
- Includes diverse outputs across all languages.
- Allows analysis at global, continental, national, city, and sector levels.

6.5 Comprehensive Institutional and Individual Analytics

Impact: Provides actionable insights for strategic development.

- Percentile-based performance distribution.
- 5-year trend tracking.
- Benchmarking tools for recognition and planning.

6.6 Commitment to Academic Integrity

Impact: Maintains the credibility of scholarly work through active monitoring, clear enforcement policies, and collaborative accountability.

- Detection: Al, manual review, and community reporting work together to identify unethical practices such as false authorship, citation manipulation, fabricated content, and other misconduct.
- Removal Due to Ethical Issues: Profiles involved in false authorship, retracted publications, citation cartels, excessive self-citation, or fabricated content may be removed without refund — even for premium members.
- Transparency Violations: Individuals who repeatedly hide or delete their Google Scholar profiles to obstruct data transparency may be disqualified from evaluation or removed.

- Warnings and Corrections: In appropriate cases, profile owners may first be given the opportunity to correct issues; serious or unresolved violations result in immediate removal.
- **Permanent Exclusion:** Repeat or severe violations lead to a lifetime ban from inclusion in the Index.
- Community and Institutional Accountability: Reports from the academic community, institutions, and subject-specific associations are reviewed to detect potential misconduct, ensuring that both individuals and institutions remain responsible for authentic contributions.

6.7 Next-Generation Institutional Tools

"The **SMART Institutional Excellence Plan** and the **Academic Contribution Analytics Module** (ACAM) are not ranking gimmicks but foundational tools of a newgeneration academic evaluation system. They provide transparent and actionable
insights that help institutions build long-term strategies, identify strengths and
weaknesses, and achieve sustainable academic excellence."

7. Strengths and Limitations of Bibliometric Databases

Ranking organizations base their evaluations on selected bibliometric databases, each with its own strengths and limitations. No data source is entirely comprehensive or flawless. Acknowledging these trade-offs is essential to justify our preference for Google Scholar (GS) and challenge the widespread belief that other databases are "perfect." Many platforms are curated citation indexes that cover 9,000–15,000 reputable journals. While often regarded as the "gold standard" due to established metrics (e.g., citation counts, h-index) and analytical tools, these databases have inherent limitations:

They disproportionately favor English-language publications and STEM fields.

Social sciences, humanities, and non-English or regional research are often underrepresented. Some databases cover only 5–20% of social science publications.

Non-article content—such as books, book chapters, and conference proceedings—is poorly represented, despite being essential in certain disciplines.

Even in natural sciences, some subfields and reputable journals are excluded, raising concerns about selection bias.

As subscription-based services, access is often limited for less-funded institutions and researchers.

As highlighted recently by several distinguished and well-established universities, closed and subscription-based data sources restrict transparency, reproducibility, and the visibility of disciplinary diversity. In contrast, open data infrastructures that

ensure transparency, reproducibility, and equal opportunity across all disciplines are becoming increasingly critical for shaping the future of research assessment.

By contrast, Google Scholar is free, broad in scope, and indexes nearly any academic content found online — including journal articles, theses, books, reports, and conference papers — across all languages and fields. This inclusiveness makes GS particularly valuable in disciplines often overlooked by traditional databases. It captures more citations in the social sciences and humanities and more effectively includes books and conference proceedings. Google Scholar also benefits from continuous updates and open access, empowering users to monitor their own impact without paywalls.

Limitations of GS: Errors in GS are generally random and not biased toward specific authors or fields, though issues like excessive self-citation or fraudulent publications can be more visible. In contrast, other databases may systematically exclude certain publication types or regions. Nevertheless, when comparisons are made within similar academic contexts, Google Scholar provides a broad, meaningful view of research impact — though citation counts should always be interpreted with caution.

Conclusion: No bibliometric database is flawless or entirely comprehensive. Our use of Google Scholar is rooted in its inclusivity and accessibility, especially for underrepresented disciplines and institutions. At the same time, we recognize its limitations and actively mitigate them through multi-layered data cleaning, anomaly detection, and ethical oversight. The academic community continues to shape and improve these data sources; therefore, the best approach is to understand the strengths and weaknesses of each and apply them carefully and transparently.

8. How Frequently Are AD Scientific Index Rankings Updated?

New entries, deletions, corrections typically visible within 0-3 days

- H-index, i10-index, and citation numbers are updated every ~ 20 days, while the ranking is refreshed every 3 days.
- Data primarily from Google Scholar with a focus on standardizing names, institutions, and data
- **User contributions** to enhance data accuracy are always welcome

9. Who Can Be Included in the List and How Does the Inclusion Process Work?

AD Scientific Index currently includes data on **2.626.817** scientists from 24.555 institutions across 221 countries. While these figures represent one of the broadest global datasets, we emphasize that **automatically including all researchers with public Google Scholar profiles is not our goal**.

The primary ways to be included are:

Paid Individual Registration: Researchers can ensure immediate inclusion by registering through the "Register" link at www.adscientificindex.com.

Institutional Registration: Universities, institutes, hospitals, and research centers can enroll their academic staff through our institutional bulk registration option.

Automatically indexing all public Google Scholar profiles would compromise data quality and sustainability. Instead, AD Scientific Index prioritizes a **sustainable**, **high-quality**, **and verifiable data structure over unlimited inclusion**, aiming to ensure **long-term academic reliability and fair representation**.

Additional considerations include:

Hidden or Deleted Profiles: Metrics (e.g., h-index, i10 index, citation count) of hidden or deleted profiles are removed from the system.

Removal Due to Ethical Issues: In cases involving false authorship, retracted publications, citation manipulation, or fabricated content, profiles may be removed without refund—even if registered.

Voluntary Removal: Profiles may be removed upon request.

As a result, some researchers from the same institution may be listed, while others are not. This reflects the structure and operational limits of the system, not individual academic merit. Researchers and institutions seeking increased visibility are encouraged to consider individual or institutional registration options tailored to their needs.

10. How Does AD Scientific Index Rank Scientists?

AD Scientific Index evaluates academic performance using six key indicators across two distinct timeframes:

Timeframes

- Total (Career-Long): Reflects cumulative academic impact over the entire career.
- **Recent (Last 5 years):** Reflects academic productivity, research momentum, and institutional contribution over the **last 5 years**.

By analyzing both dimensions, the Index offers a balanced view of long-term scholarly achievements and recent academic performance.

Core Indicators

- **H-index** (Total & Recent)
- i10-index (Total & Recent)
- Citation Count (Total & Recent)

These six indicators are used to rank over 2.6 million scientists and 24,500 institutions across

multiple hierarchical levels, including:

World, Continent, Country, University

Branch, Sub-Branch

Ranking Logic

Each ranking is based on a customized order of indicator priority, depending on the ranking type:

Ranking Type	Indicator Priority Order
Total H-index	Total H-index 🛘 Recent H-index 🗀 Total i10 🗎 Total Citations
Recent H-index	Recent H-index Recent i10 Total H-index Recent Citations
Total i10 Index	Total i10 □ Recent i10 □ Total H-index □ Total Citations
Recent i10 Index	Recent i10 Recent H-index Total i10 Recent Citations
Total Citations	Total Citations Recent Citations Total i10 Recent i10
Recent Citations	Recent Citations Total Citations Recent i10 Total i10

The AD Scientific Index's time-aware and multi-dimensional methodology allows for a more meaningful and equitable ranking of academic profiles. By combining six indicators across two timeframes (Total and Recent), the system minimizes clustering caused by similar scores, highlights rising researchers through recent performance, and enables fairer comparisons across career stages. This comprehensive approach transforms the ranking system into a deeper analytical tool that not only ranks scientists but also reflects their scientific momentum and real-time academic influence.

Studies Influencing Ranking Due to High Citation Numbers

- For unusually high citations (e.g., **CERN, ATLAS, ALICE, CMS**), authors are marked with an **asterisk "i"** to indicate this distinction.
- An alternative list excludes these studies to ensure balanced rankings.

11. How Are Institutions Ranked in the AD Scientific Index?

Institutions are ranked based on the percentile distribution of their affiliated researchers across six core indicators, each evaluated over two distinct timeframes: **Total (career-long) and Recent (last 5 years).**

This bottom-up approach considers how many researchers an institution has within the top 10%, 20%, 40%, 60%, 80%, and 90% performance percentiles—calculated in relation to the entire researcher pool (**2.626.817** scientists) listed in the AD Scientific Index. The institution's total number of affiliated researchers is also factored into the final ranking.

Ranking Logic

Rankings begin with the number of researchers an institution has in the top 10% performance group.

If two institutions have the same count in this group, the number of researchers in the next lower percentile group (e.g., top 20%) is compared.

The comparison continues sequentially through the lower percentiles (40%, 60%, 80%, and 90%) as needed.

If the tie persists across all percentiles, the institution with the greater total number of affiliated researchers ranks higher.

This methodology is independently applied to each of the following performance indicators:

- H-index (Total & Recent)
- i10-index (Total & Recent)
- Citation Count (Total & Recent)

Levels of Application

This methodology is used for:

- Global, continental, and national rankings
- Subject-based institutional rankings
- Special Rankings, such as: **Young University / Institution Rankings**Applied exclusively to institutions established within the past 30 years, using the same percentile-based methodology.

12. Subject-Specific Evaluation and Interdisciplinary Equity

As emphasized earlier, disciplinary fairness is a core principle of the AD Scientific Index. The Index evaluates academic performance across 211 subfields grouped under 13 major subject areas, including Medical & Health Sciences, Engineering & Technology, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Law, Business & Management, Education, Economics, Agriculture & Forestry, Architecture & Design, History, Theology, Philosophy, Arts & Humanities, Social Sciences & Humanities and Others. To ensure interdisciplinary equity, it applies subject-specific frameworks tailored to the unique nature of each discipline. Rather than relying on one-size-fits-all metrics, each field is assessed based on its own methods of knowledge production and academic impact, promoting fair and meaningful comparisons across all domains.

Table I. Scientists in Jamaica: Ranking and Analysis

#	Country	Country Region Rank	Country World Rank	Total Institutions	Total Scientist
1	Jamaica	18	128	13	570

Table II. All Types of Institutions in Jamaica: Ranking and Analysis

#	Institution	Country Rank	Region Rank	World Rank	Country	Type of Institution	Founded	Scientists in World Top 3%	Scientists in World Top 10%	Scientists in World Top 20%	Scientists in World Top 30%
1	University of the West Indies	1	101	1994	Jamaica	Public	1948	0	17	51	91
2	Central Caribbean Marine Institute	2	940	12601	Jamaica	Institution	1998	0	0	1	2
3	University of Technology Jamaica	3	1146	14940	Jamaica	Public	1958	0	0	0	1
4	Caribbean Maritime University	4	1149	14952	Jamaica	Public	1980	0	0	0	1
5	Northern Caribbean University	5	1495	18342	Jamaica	Private	1907	0	0	0	1
6	Edna Manley College of the Visual and Performing Arts	6	1827	21898	Jamaica	Private	1995	0	0	0	0
7	University of the Commonwealth Caribbean	7	1838	22039	Jamaica	Private	2004	0	0	0	0
8	University College of the Caribbean	8	1888	22454	Jamaica	Private	2004	0	0	0	0
9	Mico University College	9	1909	22624	Jamaica	Public	1836	0	0	0	0
10	Bank of Jamaica	10	2030	23530	Jamaica	Company	1960	0	0	0	0
11	Shortwood Teachers' College	11	2084	23915	Jamaica	Private	1885	0	0	0	0
12	International University of the Caribbean	12	2159	24279	Jamaica	Private	1995	0	0	0	0
13	All American Institute of Medical Sciences	13	2191	24476	Jamaica	Private	2009	0	0	0	0

Table III. Universities in Jamaica: Comprehensive Ranking and Analysis

#	University	Country Rank	Region Rank	World Rank	Country	Type of Institution	Founded	Scientists in World Top 3%	Scientists in World Top 10%	Scientists in World Top 20%	Scientists in World Top 30%
1	University of the West Indies	1	87	1483	Jamaica	Public	1948	0	17	51	91
2	University of Technology Jamaica	2	963	10844	Jamaica	Public	1958	0	0	0	1
3	Caribbean Maritime University	3	966	10855	Jamaica	Public	1980	0	0	0	1
4	Northern Caribbean University	4	1280	13749	Jamaica	Private	1907	0	0	0	1
5	Edna Manley College of the Visual and Performing Arts	5	1566	16460	Jamaica	Private	1995	0	0	0	0
6	University of the Commonwealth Caribbean	6	1577	16594	Jamaica	Private	2004	0	0	0	0
7	University College of the Caribbean	7	1626	16978	Jamaica	Private	2004	0	0	0	0
8	Mico University College	8	1645	17124	Jamaica	Public	1836	0	0	0	0
9	Shortwood Teachers' College	9	1798	18129	Jamaica	Private	1885	0	0	0	0
10	International University of the Caribbean	10	1866	18437	Jamaica	Private	1995	0	0	0	0
11	All American Institute of Medical Sciences	11	1906	18629	Jamaica	Private	2009	0	0	0	0

Table IV. Public Universities in Jamaica: Ranking and Analysis

#	University	Country Rank	Region Rank	World Rank	Country	Founded	Scientists in World Top 3%	Scientists in World Top 10%	Scientists in World Top 20%	Scientists in World Top 30%
1	University of the West Indies	1	71	1275	Jamaica	1948	0	17	51	91
2	University of Technology Jamaica	2	554	6627	Jamaica	1958	0	0	0	1
3	Caribbean Maritime University	3	556	6634	Jamaica	1980	0	0	0	1
4	Mico University College	4	913	9525	Jamaica	1836	0	0	0	0

Table V. Private Universities in Jamaica: Ranking and Analysis

#	University	Country Rank	Region Rank	World Rank	Country	Founded		Scientists in World Top 10%	Scientists in World Top 20%	Scientists in World Top 30%
1	Northern Caribbean University	1	566	5782	Jamaica	1907	0	0	0	1
2	Edna Manley College of the Visual and Performing Arts	2	705	7239	Jamaica	1995	0	0	0	0
3	University of the Commonwealth Caribbean	3	708	7313	Jamaica	2004	0	0	0	0
4	University College of the Caribbean	4	726	7523	Jamaica	2004	0	0	0	0
5	Shortwood Teachers' College	5	811	8091	Jamaica	1885	0	0	0	0
6	International University of the Caribbean	6	857	8249	Jamaica	1995	0	0	0	0
7	All American Institute of Medical Sciences	7	882	8333	Jamaica	2009	0	0	0	0

Table VI. Young Universities in Jamaica: Ranking and Analysis

#	University	Country Rank	Region Rank	World Rank	Country	Founded		Scientists in World Top 10%	Scientists in World Top 20%	Scientists in World Top 30%
1	Edna Manley College of the Visual and Performing Arts	5	1566	16460	Jamaica	1995	0	0	0	0
2	University of the Commonwealth Caribbean	6	1577	16594	Jamaica	2004	0	0	0	0
3	University College of the Caribbean	7	1626	16978	Jamaica	2004	0	0	0	0
4	International University of the Caribbean	10	1866	18437	Jamaica	1995	0	0	0	0
5	All American Institute of Medical Sciences	11	1906	18629	Jamaica	2009	0	0	0	0

Table VII. Institutions in Jamaica: Ranking and Analysis

#	Institution	Country Rank	Region Rank	World Rank	Country	Founded	Scientists in World Top 3%	Scientists in World Top 10%	Scientists in World Top 20%	Scientists in World Top 30%
1	Central Caribbean Marine Institute	1	114	2446	Jamaica	1998	0	0	1	2

Table VIII. Companies in Jamaica: Ranking and Analysis

#	Company	Country Rank	Region Rank	World Rank	Country	Founded	Scientists in World Top 3%	Scientists in World Top 10%	Scientists in World Top 20%	Scientists in World Top 30%
[Bank of Jamaica	1	39	1930	Jamaica	1960	0	0	0	0

Table IX. Hospitals in Jamaica: Ranking and Analysis

# Hospital	Country	Region	World	Country Founded	Scientists in	Scientists in	Scientists in	Scientists in
# nospitai	Rank	Rank	Rank	Country Founded	World Top 3%	World Top 10%	World Top 20%	World Top 30%