

Journal Pre-proof

The state of social science research on antimicrobial resistance

Snorre Sylvester Frid-Nielsen, Olivier Rubin, Erik Baekkeskov



PII: S0277-9536(19)30591-X

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112596>

Reference: SSM 112596

To appear in: *Social Science & Medicine*

Received Date: 14 February 2019

Revised Date: 4 October 2019

Accepted Date: 10 October 2019

Please cite this article as: Frid-Nielsen, S.S., Rubin, O., Baekkeskov, E., The state of social science research on antimicrobial resistance, *Social Science & Medicine* (2019), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112596>.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2019 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

Title

The state of social science research on antimicrobial resistance

Author list

Snorre Sylvester Frid-Nielsen, Department of Social Sciences and Business, Roskilde University

Olivier Rubin, Department of Social Sciences and Business, Roskilde University

Erik Baekkeskov, School of Social and Political Sciences, The University of Melbourne

Corresponding author

Snorre Sylvester Frid-Nielsen

Address:

Roskilde University

Universitetsvej 1, 25.2

4000 Roskilde

Denmark

E-mail: ssfn@ruc.dk

Telephone: +45 4674 2340

Abstract

This paper investigates the genealogy of social science research into antimicrobial resistance (AMR) by piecing together the bibliometric characteristics of this branch of research. Drawing on the Web of Science as the primary database, the analysis shows that while academic interest in AMR has increased substantially over the last few years, social science research continues to constitute a negligible share of total academic contributions. More in-depth network analysis of citations and bibliometric couplings suggests how the impact of social science research on the scientific discourse on AMR is both peripheral and spread thin. We conclude that this limited social science engagement is puzzling considering the clear academic and practical demand and the many existing interdisciplinary outlets.

Keywords

Antimicrobial resistance; health policy; social science; bibliometrics; network analysis

Introduction

Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) refers to the process whereby microorganisms develop resistance to the antimicrobial against which they were originally vulnerable (Jindal et al., 2015). These resistant bacteria can spread from one person to the next just like any other bacterial infection or they can spread from animals to humans or vice-versa. Antibiotic treatments that we take for granted today are becoming increasingly ineffective; as a result, even minor illnesses, routine surgery or childbirth might become very risky endeavors in the future (Hoffman et al., 2015). While the process of AMR cannot be halted, well-recognized policies and practices already exist that would lead to more sustainable and effective usage of antimicrobial drugs. Despite consensus on what constitutes effective AMR policies and practices, several scholars have begun to call for more systematic social science research that could help address the practical challenges with regards implementation, communication, supranational coordination, agenda-setting and so on (Carlet et al., 2014; Laxminarayan et al., 2013; Laxminarayan and Malani, 2007; Nathan and Cars, 2014; Roca et al., 2015). So far, the call for social science research into AMR has gone largely unheeded. This paper uses bibliometrics to present and explore the puzzling fact that AMR has hitherto received so little attention in the social sciences. Concretely, we present the scope in terms of total citations among different global health emergencies, followed by an exploration of citation patterns to identify characteristics of social science research in AMR specifically.

Previous bibliometric studies on AMR concern drug-resistance in specific diseases and bacteria (Qin, 2000; Sweileh et al., 2016a, 2017a, 2017b), antibiotic agents (Sweileh et al., 2016b), as well as disease surveillance programs (Reaves et al., 2017). This study addresses the gap in the literature relating to the

role of the social sciences through a comparative approach and by applying advanced network analysis methods. This study adheres to the PRISMA standard of reporting to provide transparency regarding the data gathering process and reproducibility of the results. The data for the bibliometric research consists of 1,311 contributions pulled from the Social Science Citation Index in Web of Science using a topic search for all records including “antimicrobial resistance” and “antibiotic resistance” in the period 1956-2018. The Web of Science database only includes international journals that meet specified academic criteria with regards publishing standards, editorial content, diversity of authorship, citation rates, and so forth (Thomson Reuters, 2018). Academic contributions in the database are categorized in overarching indices as well as subject categories. The data thus allows for the tracking of academic contributions on AMR over time and across research disciplines as well as subject categories. To account for potential selection bias of publications in Web of Science, the study also draws from other sources, including Google Books and Google Scholar, to validate the findings.

The study proceeds as follows. The following section compares the scope of social science research in AMR to similar global health emergencies. The study then uses network analysis methods to uncover the characteristics of social science research, revealing power dynamics and disciplinary structure within the citation patterns of the field. Finally, a brief conclusion suggests future directions to better incorporate the social sciences.

The scope of social science research

The academic interest in AMR has increased substantially in the last few years. In 2018, more than six thousand contributions in the Web of Science Citation Index referred to AMR in their topic. This is a quadrupling of the average number of annual contributions in the period 2000-2009. Google Scholar displays a similar trend. The number of AMR publications more than doubled from an annual average of

around 7,200 in the period 2000-2009 to an annual average of 16,300 in the period 2010-2017. Even controlling for the overall increase in academic contributions, the academic attention to AMR appears to have increased over time. Today, for every 1,000 contributions in The Science Citation Index, three contributions include references to AMR in their topic. This is up from an average of just one in 2,000 during the 1990s. In other words, AMR gets more academic attention, and the trend appears to be increasing. This rising trend holds true for all three indices. However, the share of social science contributions remains miniscule. Just 1,311 academic contributions were categorized in the Social Sciences Citation Index in 1956-2018. Further, the share of social science contributions compared to science contributions has remained relatively constant throughout the years.

[Figure 1 about here]

Caption: Social science/science-ratio of contributions in the Web of Sciences

Description: Data based on the following topical key-word searches in The Science Citation Index (science) and The Social Sciences Citation Index (social sciences): "Antimicrobial resistance", "Malaria", "Ebola", "AIDS" and "Obesity."

Figure 1 compares the ratio of social science contributions with respect to science contributions across a selection of health challenges. The other health threats all display epidemic characteristics, and the World Health Organization (WHO) has identified them as some of the greatest health threats of the 21st century (WHO, 2017, 2018). A value of 1 indicates parity: if a science contribution on AMR is published, then either another social science contribution will be published alongside it, or the contribution is sufficiently interdisciplinary to also be classified as social science. Two findings stand out from the figure. First, social science research usually lags the sciences when it comes to addressing new and complex health emergencies. In 1991, the ratio never exceeded 0.2 for any of the health threats. Moving

forward, the share of social science research increases for all health threats, most notably HIV/AIDS, which is no longer considered life-threatening or highly contagious in most parts of the world. This lag should not be begrudged. It appears reasonable to first seek to understand the pathology and epidemiology of a new health threat before broadening the research to include a socio-economic perspective. The horizontal dashed line expresses the social science/science-ratio across all contributions in the Web of Science, suggesting that the rising ratio is not merely a reflection of a general rising trend of social science contributions vis-a-vis the sciences. Second, while this overarching research dynamic for the social sciences appears to be a general rule, the threat from AMR is very much the exception. The threat of AMR has been known for more than half a century without any noticeable upsurge in attention from the social sciences. The social science/science-ratio never exceeds 0.03 and the average ratio for the period is less than one-third of the second lowest ratio of malaria. Investigating major works on AMR such as peer-reviewed books and reports produces a similar pattern. In the Google Books Database, close to 400 books and reports (with an ISBN-number) referred to “antimicrobial resistance” or “antibiotic resistance” in their title. Social science contributions were identified based on three parameters: (i) whether the title included social terms; (ii) whether the contribution was published in a social science series; or (iii) whether some of the authors had backgrounds in the social sciences. Of the entire corpus of publications, the share of social science publications was negligible, at around one percent. Even books where one would reasonably expect some contributions from social scientists failed to draw on such expertise. None of the more than 50 scholars who contributed to the mammoth work on antimicrobial resistance in developing countries, for example, had a background in the social sciences (Sosa et al., 2010). Other than a few economic reports (O’Neill, 2016; Smith et al., 2001), only two books on AMR had a clear foundation in the social sciences: *Risking Antimicrobial Resistance* written in large parts by sociologists, linguists and psychologists (Jensen and Fynbo, 2018) and *One Health and the*

Politics of Antimicrobial Resistance written by an M.D. with a degree in public policy (Kahn, 2016). This lack of social science attention to AMR in the academic literature is particularly troublesome considering the clear demand for more social science research.

The characteristics of social science research

The relatively limited scope of social research in AMR motivates a deeper dive into the underlying characteristics of the field. This study constructs a network based on the patterns of 48,847 citations within all existing social science contributions to visualize the nature of scholarly discourse (see Online Appendix for code). Figure 2 visualizes the network of social science citations. The network includes top outlets that received at least 0.2 percent of the total citations in the corpus of contributions, representing both academic journals and organizational reports. Each node within the network represents the aggregated citations of each outlet. Outlets are connected by edges which signify the level of similarity between outlets. Similarity between outlets is measured through bibliometric coupling, which expresses to what extent outlets A and B are co-cited in outlet C, based on the assumption that publications in scientific outlets that are cited together share similar characteristics in terms of their content (Leydesdorff, 2007; Leydesdorff and Rafols, 2011). For example, journal articles citing publications from *British Medical Journal* may be more likely to also cite *Pediatrics*, compared to an outlet such as *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*, which focuses on treating animals. As such, *British Medical Journal* and *Pediatrics* would likely be the most similar of these three journals, in terms of bibliometric coupling. Turning to the network visualization, we see this is indeed the case: looking to the north of the network, *British Medical Journal* and *Pediatrics* are directly connected by an edge, while information must travel through numerous pathways to reach *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* towards the south.

The study uses the social network analysis concept of “betweenness centrality” as a proxy for power and interdisciplinarity within the network (Freeman, 1978). Betweenness measures to what extent a given node is placed along shortest paths between other nodes within the network. For example, there is no edge between *British Medical Journal* and WHO, indicating that information does not readily flow between these outlets. However, both outlets are joined to *Social Science and Medicine*, demonstrating its control over translating the flow of information between the specialized knowledge in *British Medical Journal* and the more general audience of WHO’s reports. Nodes with high betweenness centrality essentially control the flow of information—the network would fall apart if these highly central nodes were removed.

The core of the network consists of medical and microbiology journals that do not aim to publish social science research, including *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy*, *Applied Environmental Microbiology*, *New England Journal of Medicine*, *British Medical Journal*, and *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*. Over 55 percent of the network’s shortest paths pass through these journals, and the journals also receive a large share of the total citations. Outlets that generally seek impact beyond the field of medicine are decidedly less central to the network. The most central of these non-specialized journals include *Lancet Infectious Disease*, a medical journal explicitly aiming to influence global health policy, the general science journal *PLOS One*, and publications from WHO, which account for approximately 20 percent of the network’s shortest paths combined.

[Figure 2 about here]

Caption: Citation network for AMR social science research, 1956-2018

Description: Node size represents the percentage of shortest paths passing through each node. Label size reflects the number of citations per outlet, while darker edges between nodes indicates a higher level of similarity. Node color indicates community membership.

Clearly, social science research on AMR heavily relies on knowledge produced within the natural sciences and medicine. The few social science journals present in the network remain at the periphery, including *Social Science and Medicine*, *Health Policy*, and *American Journal of Public Health*. Among these, *Social Science and Medicine* makes the greatest impact, both in terms of network centrality and total citations. The social science journals are all interdisciplinary and health-domain specific, highlighting that more general social science outlets have failed to penetrate the discourse. Social science research is instead largely represented in outlets relating to public health, including publications from WHO and *Eurosurveillance*, which is funded by the European Commission to address public health challenges. Further, the included social science outlets do not share edges, indicating the lack of a cohesive discourse. For scholarly communication to flow between *Social Science and Medicine* and *Health Policy*, for example, it must pass through *British Medical Journal*. Notably absent are economics outlets. Despite *Health Economics* being the most cited in its field, it did not receive enough citations to be included in the network. This is surprising, considering that economics was the first disciplinary perspective to be applied to AMR. Economic analyses of AMR policies can be traced back to the late 1980's, but the bulk of the work is published after 2010, mainly in the form of cost-benefit calculations of AMR policies. Recently, studies broadened to address the economic and poverty impacts of AMR, but this does not emerge in the network (Ahmed et al., 2018; Laxminarayan et al., 2016). Bibliometric data intrinsically weights historical publications, since they can accrue more citations, highlighting a potential limitation in this approach.

Certain groups of outlets within the network may be more well connected in terms of their bibliometric coupling, indicating distinct epistemic communities. This study uses the Louvain algorithm to inductively detect such communities, by finding constellations with maximum intergroup similarity and minimal intragroup similarity (Blondel et al., 2008). Five epistemic communities emerge from this analysis, hand-labeled in terms of their research themes and shared discourse. Again, a strong communicative practice among social science scholars fails to materialize—the social science outlets are spread out across these communities. Instead, medicine and microbiology remain dominant. At the center of the network, we find a cluster of highly cited journals categorized within clinical microbiology. This cluster serves as an interface between pure medical journals to the north, and applied microbiology to the south. Moving further south lies a peripheral cluster of journals engaged with environmental science. The cluster towards the east is the most diverse, containing general science journals such as *Science* and *Nature*, as well as outlets concerned with public health such as WHO, *Eurosurveillance*, *BMC Public Health* and *Tropical Medicine and International Health*. Notably, *Lancet*—a traditional medical journal—also appears in this cluster. This indicates that *Lancet* to a larger extent penetrates the discourse of more general science and policy-related outlets within social science research on AMR, compared to other medical journals.

To illuminate the contrast between AMR research and other pressing global issues, we analyzed the patterns of social science research on climate change. Diverse social science disciplines play distinct roles in climate change research (see Appendix). Not only is research on climate change management on equal footing with the natural sciences in terms of centrality, there are distinct clusters of journals within economics, geography, and behavioral sciences. Similarly, drawing upon a range of social science disciplines can offer numerous benefits to AMR research. Currently, the disciplines of anthropology and sociology are almost exclusively applied in interdisciplinary public health journals rather than in their

respective disciplinary journals. The research mostly relies on qualitative methods to provide insights on policy decision-making, medical practices, patient behavior and public debates. In this journal, for example, sociology constitutes the main social science approach to AMR research where it has recently been applied to expose trauma and stigmatization among refugees and pig farmers (Fynbo and Jensen, 2018; Kamenshchikova et al., 2018).

Conclusion

Academic attention to AMR has increased substantially both in absolute and relative terms. However, the modest attention from the social sciences seems to indicate that these academic fields lag with respect to contributing insights that can help the world in addressing this emerging, complex, and global health crisis. The impact of social science research on scientific discourse on AMR is both peripheral and spread thin. This is regrettable, seeing that scholars and practitioners alike have identified a clear demand for more social science research into the topic. Social science contributions have proven effective in illuminating important social dimensions of AMR such as adverse patient and prescriber behavior (Jensen et al., 2018); deficient organizational and regulatory management structures (Kahn, 2016); ethical dilemmas of distributional justice (Littmann and Viens 2015); the political economy facing pharmaceutical manufactures (Laxminarayan and Malani, 2007; O'Neill, 2016); and global governance regimes that can address collective action problems of AMR stewardship (Hoffman and Ottersen, 2015; Padiyara et al., 2018; Rochford et al., 2018). However, most social science research on AMR is currently subsumed in public health or medical journals. This type of research should be applauded and encouraged. But given the choice of venues, such research risks never being exposed to and engaging with core social science debates and scholarship. Hence, AMR-research within particular social science disciplines is also needed. Participation in dedicated social science discourses constitutes an underutilized avenue for developing and validating contributions that investigate AMR thematically.

Rather than exclusively focusing on how social science can contribute to the understanding of AMR, the distinct socio-economic dynamics of AMR could pollinate new research insights within particular social science disciplines.

Many high-ranking interdisciplinary journals, such as this one, already engage with the intersection between health and social science and provide fruitful venues for collaborative AMR research. With these academic and institutional openings in mind, a question arises. The social sciences have engaged unreservedly with other contentious, complex and transboundary themes such as climate change, violent conflicts, human rights and migration. So *why* is there much less social science research on AMR? One tentative explanation is health experts' relatively high authority and autonomy from other social influences (Baekkeskov, 2016; Immergut, 1992; Starr, 1982). AMR research may be siloed within health departments and agencies where studies, including those pertaining to social dimensions, are primarily put forth by health experts (WHO, 2019). Powerful and close-knit epistemic communities can be difficult to penetrate for other disciplines. Yet the increasing demand and the many existing academic outlets should encourage more social scientists to engage forcefully with AMR as a societal issue, and realize potentials for new social scientific insights from studying AMR. In earlier decades of climate change research, for example, related social science was also limited (IPCC, 1990, 2004). But today, the social science/science-ratio for climate change is around 0.3, and the IPCC assessment reports address social issues in addition to natural science (IPCC, 2014). The global fight against AMR can benefit from similarly engaged social science research, ideally in collaboration with medical experts in interdisciplinary journals such as this one.

References

Ahmed, S.A., Barış, E., Go, et al., 2018. Assessing the global poverty effects of antimicrobial resistance.

World Dev. 111, 148–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.WORLDDEV.2018.06.022>

Blondel, V.D., Guillaume, J.L., Lambiotte, R., Lefebvre, E., 2008. Fast unfolding of communities in large

networks. *J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp.* 2008. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-5468/2008/10/P10008>

Baekkeskov, E., 2016. Same Threat, Different Responses: Experts Steering Politicians and Stakeholders in 2009 H1N1 Vaccination Policy-Making. *Pub. Adm.* 94, 2(2), 299–315.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12244>

Carlet, J., Pulcini, C., Piddock, L.J.V., 2014. Antibiotic resistance: a geopolitical issue. *Clin. Microbiol.*

Infect. 20, 949–953. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-0691.12767>

Freeman, L.C., 1978. Centrality in social networks conceptual clarification. *Soc. Networks* 1, 215–239.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-8733\(78\)90021-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-8733(78)90021-7)

Fynbo, L., Jensen, C.S., 2018. Antimicrobial stigmatization: Public health concerns about conventional pig farming and pig farmers' experiences with stigmatization. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 201, 1–8.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.01.036>

Hoffman, S.J., Outtersson, K., Røttingen, J.-A., et al., 2015. An international legal framework to address antimicrobial resistance. *Bull. World Health Organ.* 93, 66. <https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.15.152710>

Immergut, E., 1992. The rules of the game: the logic of health policy-making in France, Switzerland and Sweden, in: Steinmo, S., et al. (Eds.), *Structuring Politics*. Cambridge University Press, 57–89.

IPCC, 2014. AR5 Synthesis Report: Climate Change 2014. <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/syr/> (accessed 1.24.19).

IPCC, 2004. 16 Years of Scientific Assessment in Support of the Climate Convention.

<https://web.archive.org/web/20080216053854/https://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/10th-anniversary/anniversary-brochure.pdf> (accessed 1.24.19).

IPCC, 1990. The First Assessment Reports. <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/climate-change-the-ipcc-1990-and-1992-assessments/> (accessed 1.24.19).

Jensen, C.S., Fynbo, L., 2018. *Risking Antimicrobial Resistance*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Jindal, B.A.K., Pandya, M.K., Khan, M.I.D., 2015. Antimicrobial resistance: A public health challenge. *Med. J. Armed Forces India* 71, 178–181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mjafi.2014.04.011>

Kahn, L.H., 2016. *One health and the politics of antimicrobial resistance*. John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.

Kamenshchikova, A., Wolffs, P.F.G., Hoebe, et al., 2018. Complex narratives of health, stigma and control: Antimicrobial resistance screening among non-hospitalized refugees. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 212, 43–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.07.012>

Laxminarayan, R., Duse, A., Wattal, C., et al., 2013. Antibiotic resistance—the need for global solutions. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* 13, 1057–1098. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(13\)70318-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(13)70318-9)

Laxminarayan, R., Malani, A., 2007. Extending the cure: policy responses to the growing threat of antibiotic resistance. Resources for the Future, Washington, DC.

Laxminarayan, R., Matsoso, P., Pant, S., 2016. Access to effective antimicrobials: a worldwide challenge. *Lancet* 387, 168–175. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(15\)00474-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00474-2)

- Leydesdorff, L., 2007. Betweenness centrality as an indicator of the interdisciplinarity of scientific journals. *J. Am. Soc. Inf. Sci. Technol.* 58, 1303–1319. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20614>
- Leydesdorff, L., Rafols, I., 2011. Indicators of the interdisciplinarity of journals: Diversity, centrality, and citations. *J. Informetr.* 5, 87–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2010.09.002>
- Littmann, J., Viens, A. M., 2015. The ethical significance of antimicrobial resistance. *Pub. Health Eth.*, 8(3), 209–224. <https://doi.org/10.1093/phe/phv025>
- Nathan, C., Cars, O., 2014. Antibiotic Resistance — Problems, Progress, and Prospects. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 371, 1761–1763. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1408040>
- O’Neill, J., 2016. Tackling drug-resistant infections globally: Final report and recommendation. AMR Review, London.
- Qin, J., 2000. Semantic similarities between a keyword database and a controlled vocabulary database: An investigation in the antibiotic resistance literature. *J. Am. Soc. Inf. Sci. Technol.* 51, 166–180. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-4571\(2000\)51:2<166::AID-ASI8>3.0.CO;2-Z](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(2000)51:2<166::AID-ASI8>3.0.CO;2-Z)
- Padiyara, P., Inoue, H., Sprenger, M. 2018. Global governance mechanisms to address antimicrobial resistance. *Infect. Dis.*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1178633718767887>
- Reaves, E.J., Valle, R., Chandrasekera, R.M., et al., 2017. Use of Bibliometric Analysis to Assess the Scientific Productivity and Impact of the Global Emerging Infections Surveillance and Response System Program, 2006–2012. *Mil. Med.* 182, e1749–e1756. <https://doi.org/10.7205/MILMED-D-16-00276>
- Roca, I., Akova, M., Baquero, F., et al., 2015. The global threat of antimicrobial resistance: science for intervention. *New Microbes New Infect.* 6, 22–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nmni.2015.02.007>

Rochford, C., Sridhar, D., Woods, N., et al., 2018. Global governance of antimicrobial resistance. *Lancet* 391(10134), 1976–1978. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)31117-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31117-6)

Smith, R., Coast, J., Millar, M.R., et al., 2001. Interventions against antimicrobial resistance: A review of the literature and exploration of modelling cost-effectiveness. Global Forum for Health Research, Geneva.

Sosa, A. de J., Byarugaba, D.K., Amábile-Cuevas, C.F., et al. (Eds.), 2010. Antimicrobial Resistance in Developing Countries. Springer New York, New York, NY. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-89370-9>

Starr, P., 1982. *The Social Transformation of American Medicine*. Basic Books, New York.

Sweileh, W.M., AbuTaha, A.S., Sawalha, A.F., et al., 2017a. Bibliometric analysis of worldwide publications on multi-, extensively, and totally drug - resistant tuberculosis (2006-2015). *Multidiscip. Respir. Med.* 11, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40248-016-0081-0>

Sweileh, W.M., Al-Jabi, S.W., Sawalha, A.F., et al., 2017b. Bibliometric Analysis of Worldwide Publications on Antimalarial Drug Resistance (2006–2015). *Malar. Res. Treat.* 2017, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/6429410>

Sweileh, W.M., Al-Jabi, S.W., Sawalha, et al., 2016a. Bibliometric analysis of publications on Campylobacter: (2000-2015). *J. Health. Popul. Nutr.* 35, 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41043-016-0076-7>

Sweileh, W.M., Shraim, N.Y., Al-Jabi, et al., 2016b. Bibliometric analysis of global scientific research on carbapenem resistance (1986-2015). *Ann. Clin. Microbiol. Antimicrob.* 15(56). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12941-016-0169-6>

Thomson Reuters, 2018. The Thomson Reuters selection process.


<https://clarivate.com/essays/journalselectionprocess> (accessed 1.24.19).

WHO, 2017. World Health Report – Overview: Global Public Health Threats in the 21st Century. World Health Organization, Geneva.

WHO, 2018. 10 threats to global health in 2018. <https://medium.com/@who/10-threats-to-global-health-in-2018-232daf0bbef3> (accessed 1.24.19).

WHO, 2019. No Time to Wait: Securing the future from drug-resistant infections.

<https://www.who.int/antimicrobial-resistance/interagency-coordination-group/final-report/en/> (accessed 6.28.19).



- Business
- Water resources
- Transportation
- Health
- Forecasting
- Behavioral science
- Natural science
- Ecology
- Energy
- Archaeology
- Economics
- Climate management
- News media
- Coastal management
- Geography

Betweenness centrality

- 3% shortest paths
- 5% shortest paths
- 10% shortest paths


Similarity


- 25–34%
- 35–44%
- 45–54%
- >55%

Acknowledgements

The Independent Research Fund Denmark funded this research under the project "Exploring the policy dynamics of global antimicrobial resistance initiatives" 2018-2022 (project number: 8019-00005A).

Journal Pre-proof





Betweenness centrality	Similarity
○ 3% shortest paths	— 25–34%
○ 5% shortest paths	— 35–44%
○ 10% shortest paths	— 45–54%
	— >55%

Clusters	
■	Medicine
■	Applied Microbiology
■	Clinical Microbiology
■	Environmental Science
□	Public health and General Science

Research highlights

- Despite growing interest in AMR, social science research lags other health crises.
- Social science is fragmented and peripheral in the scientific discourse on AMR.
- Most social science research is published in interdisciplinary health outlets.
- Future contributions should also engage with more general social science audiences.

Journal Pre-proof