Resource Summary Report

Generated by NIF on Aug 9, 2026

SciScore

RRID:SCR_016251
Type: Tool

Proper Citation

SciScore (RRID:SCR_016251)

Resource Information

URL: http://sciscore.com

Proper Citation: SciScore (RRID:SCR_016251)

Description: Text-mining software that reviews methods sections of scientific articles. It provides a numerical score to represent the "reproducibility" of the article's research.

Synonyms: Sci Score, SciCrunch SciScore

Resource Type: web application, text-mining software, software resource, software application

Defining Citation: PMID:35759334, PMID:33196023

Keywords: mine, text, method, journal, paper, article, research, science, biomedicine, neuroscience, scicrunch, nif, ASWG

Availability: Used by SciCrunch, Freely available, Available to the research community

Resource Name: SciScore

Resource ID: SCR_016251

Alternate URLs: http://sci-score.com

License: Commercial License

Record Creation Time: 20220129T080329+0000

Record Last Update: 20260808T190051+0000

Ratings and Alerts

No rating or validation information has been found for SciScore.

No alerts have been found for SciScore.

Data and Source Information

Source: SciCrunch Registry

Usage and Citation Metrics

We found 13 mentions in open access literature.

Listed below are recent publications. The full list is available at NIF .

Drude N, et al. (2026) Reporting quality of quantitative polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) methods in scientific publications. Research integrity and peer review, 11(1).

Eckmann P, et al. (2026) Use as directed? A comparison of software tools intended to check rigor and transparency of published work. PloS one, 21(2), e0342225.

Piekniewska A, et al. (2025) Do organisms need an impact factor? Citations of key biological resources including model organisms reveal usage patterns and impact. PloS one, 20(8), e0327344.

Piekniewska A, et al. (2024) Do organisms need an impact factor? Citations of key biological resources including model organisms reveal usage patterns and impact. bioRxiv : the preprint server for biology.

Kahn RA, et al. (2024) Antibody characterization is critical to enhance reproducibility in biomedical research. eLife, 13.

Sever R, et al. (2023) Biomedical publishing: Past historic, present continuous, future conditional. PLoS biology, 21(10), e3002234.

H??roux M, et al. (2023) Poor statistical reporting, inadequate data presentation and spin persist despite Journal awareness and updated Information for Authors. F1000Research, 12, 1483.

Riedel N, et al. (2022) Replacing bar graphs of continuous data with more informative graphics: are we making progress? Clinical science (London, England : 1979), 136(15), 1139.

Menke J, et al. (2022) Establishing Institutional Scores With the Rigor and Transparency Index: Large-scale Analysis of Scientific Reporting Quality. Journal of medical Internet research, 24(6), e37324.

Bannach-Brown A, et al. (2021) Technological advances in preclinical meta-research. BMJ open science, 5(1), e100131.

Weissgerber T, et al. (2021) Automated screening of COVID-19 preprints: can we help authors to improve transparency and reproducibility? Nature medicine, 27(1), 6.

Menke J, et al. (2020) The Rigor and Transparency Index Quality Metric for Assessing Biological and Medical Science Methods. iScience, 23(11), 101698.

Babic Z, et al. (2019) Incidences of problematic cell lines are lower in papers that use RRIDs to identify cell lines. eLife, 8.