



**BIBLIOGRAPHY MANAGEMENT WITH REFERENCE
MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE: A CASE STUDY**

Avinash Kumar Singh

Research Scholar, Department of Library and Information Science
Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow.

Corresponding Author - Avinash Kumar Singh

Email - avinashsingh4423@gmail.com

DOI - 10.5281/zenodo.7204707

Abstract:

Reference management was not always as easy as it is currently due to the innovative software that began receiving popularity in 1980s. In 1980s, only two or three reference management software's (RMSs) were available, but now >28 RMSs are accessible to research scholars, students, faculty members, and librarians.

This study explored the availability of RMSs and compared three RMS: Mendeley, Zotero, and Endnote. The researchers downloaded 117 articles and selected 50 papers related to the study based on the literature review. The study can help in creating awareness among researchers to use RMS for ensuring proper citations.

Keywords: RMS, CMS, BMS, Mendeley, Zotero, Endnote.

Introduction:

Succinct written communication is an inherent and vital aspect for the members of scientific and other academic communities. A critical component of scientific writing is providing the accurate references or citations of documents. However, managing references while reporting study findings is a strenuous task. The onus of providing the information about previous studies with clarity and honesty depends on the authors, and to achieve this purpose, reference management software (RMS) proves to be most useful. RMS ensures a streamlined and error-free citation flow, which provides an engaging and credible content to the scientific community. RMS presents multiple advantages. Using RMS, the bibliographical information of cited references can be provided appropriately

to guide readers to new resources for an independent and in-depth study. Other advantages of RMS include facilities that facilitate library access without wastage of time, enhanced collaboration ease, and the flexibility to provide citations in any referencing style of choice. Efficient use of RMS has the potential of enhancing the quality of work produced by researchers besides giving them more time to invest in in-depth research by cutting down on the time required to manually collate and verify resources.

Literature Review:

Ivey and Crumⁱ compared four RMSs: Endnote, Mendeley, RefWorks, and Zotero. They discussed the strengths and weaknesses of these RMSs and reported that all the RMSs exhibit advantages and disadvantages. Zotero is a free online tool

that brands itself as a ‘personal research assistant’ and is more user friendly than the other three RMSs..

Mantikayan and Abdulgani ⁱⁱ compared three bibliographic management software (BMS): Zotero, Mendeley, and Endnote. Their study was based on the analysis of the literature available on BMS. They ranked Mendeley as the optimal BMS, followed by Zotero and Endnote. Moreover, they considered the how specific project requirements prompt researchers to select the software that optimally caters to their needs. They concluded that even though no single BMS could simultaneously cater to all the requirements and was perfect, each unique software had some helpful features.

Peters ⁱⁱⁱ reviewed the endnote reference management tool by using systematic review techniques recognized by PRISMA guidelines. The results showed the tool to be user friendly with sharing features.

Kaur and Dhindsa ^{iv} compared three reference management tools: Mendeley, Zotero, and Read Cube. They reported that only Mendeley provides the facility of document editing to its users and offers more storage space than Read cube and Zotero. Moreover, Read Cube offers more sharing options than Mendeley and Zotero and supports 20 citation styles; Zotero provides more export and import options than Zotero and Read Cube.

Kalita ^v analyzed the features of Mendeley and Zotero RMS. They compared 16 features of the two softwares and reported that Zotero and Mendeley could be used to extract ten and seven features, respectively, out of the 16 selected features. Their study indicated that Zotero is more user friendly than Mendeley.

Butros and Taylor ^{vi} analyzed the advantages and disadvantages of commercially and freely available RMSs to provide directions to students and to help them select the appropriate software for their respective studies.

According to review outcomes, three RMSs are considerably popular among the users: Mendeley, Endnote, and Zotero.

Study Objectives:

- Determine the availability of RMSs.
- Explore and compare the features of Mendeley, Endnote, and Zotero RMSs.

Methodology:

The researchers downloaded 117 articles and selected only 50 papers that were positively related to the study. A total of 65, 34, and 18 articles were downloaded from Google, Google Scholar, and ResearchGate, respectively. Based on based on the literature review, the three RMSs were selected for comparison (Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1: Availability of RMS in the Market

S. No.	Name of Tools	Web Address	Commercial or Free of Cost	Release Date
1	Aigaion	www.aigaion.de	Freemium	2005
2	Bib base	Bibase.org	Freemium	Not found
3	Biblio scape	www.biblioscape.com	Commercial	1998

4	Bibus	Bibus-biblio.sourceforge.net	Freemium	2009
5	Bib desk	Bibdesk.sourceforge.io	Freemium (with some limitation)	2002
6	Bookends	www.sonnysoftware.com	Commercial	1988
7	Bibtex	www.bibtex.org	Not found	1985
8	Citavi	Citavi.com	Commercial	2006
9	Colwiz	www.colwiz.com	Freemium	2016
10	Cite fast	www.citefast.com	Freemium	2008
11	Cite lighter	Edshelf.com	Freemium	Not found
12	Cite u like	www.citeulike.org	Freemium	2004
13	Cite4me	Cite4me.org	Freemium	2016
14	Endnote	www.endnote.com	Commercial	1988
15	Easy bib	www.easybib.com	Freemium (with some limitation)	2001
16	Paper pile	Paperpile.com	Commercial	2012
17	Papers	www.papersapp.com	Commercial	Not found
18	RefWorks	www.refworks.com	Commercial	2001
19	Refbase	www.refbase.net	Freemium	2003
20	Ref DB	Refdb.sourceforge.net	Freemium	2001
21	Reference Manager	www.refman.com	Commercial	1984
22	Mendeley	Mendeley.com	Freemium (with some limitation)	2008
23	JabRef	Jabref.org	Freemium	2003
24	Sente	www.thirdstreetsoftware.com	Commercial	2004
25	Qiqqa	Qiqqa.com	Freemium (with some limitation)	2009
26	Wikindx	Wikindx.com	Freemium	2004
27	Wizfolio	Wizfolio.com	Commercial	2008
28	Zotero	www.zotero.org	Freemium	2006

Table 2 : Comparison of RMSs			
Comparison Factor	Zotero	Mendeley	Endnote
Website	www.zotero.org	Mendeley.com	Endnote.com
Operating system	Windows, Mac IOS, Linux	Windows, Mac IOS, Linux	Windows, Mac IOS
Storage capacity	300 MB (Purchase option available)	1GB (Purchase option available)	Unlimited
Language	Available in more than 30 language's	English	English
Collaboration	Yes	Yes, free for up to 3 group members (more extensive group plans available for purchase)	Yes with 100 users
Create a bibliography with different styles	Yes, Available	Yes, Available	Yes, Available
Automatic citation extraction from PDFs	Yes, Available	Yes, Available	Yes, Available
Cost	Free to all users; open source (there are costs for upgraded storage).	Free to all users (there are costs for upgraded storage).	Premium
Import citation	Yes, Available	Yes, Available	Yes, Available
Duplicate indicator	Yes, Available	Yes, Available	Yes, Available
Sync	Yes, Available	Yes, Available	Yes, Available

Conclusions:

RMS is a useful tool for researchers for citing accurate reference because the manually management of a bibliography is time-consuming and error-

prone process. Full-text tracking citation or citing references properly in scientific papers and creating the bibliography are the key functions of RMS. In this study, the researchers explored the availability of

28 RMSs for users and compared the three most popular RMSs: Mendeley, Endnote, and Zotero. This study can help for researchers in selecting the appropriate reference management tool for their study.

References:

1. Camille Ivey and Janet Crum, "Choosing the Right Citation Management Tool: Endnote, Mendeley, RefWorks, or Zotero", *Journal of the Medical Library Association* 106, no. 3 (2018): 399–405, <https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2018.468>.
2. Jonathan M. Mantikayan and Montadzah Ambag Abdulgani, "Tools for the Researcher: Assessing and Selecting Citation Management Software," *CCSPC R & D Journal* 1, no. 3 (2017): 43–85.
3. Micah D. J. Peters, "Managing and Coding Reference for Systematic Review and Scoping Reviews in Endnote," *Medical Reference Service Quarterly* 36, no. 1 (2017): 19–31, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02763869.2017.1259891>.
4. Sukhpreet Kaur and Kanwalvir Singh Dhindsa, "Comparative Study of Citation and Reference Management Tools: Mendeley, Zotero and Read Cube," 2016 International Conference on ICT in Business Industry & Government (ICTBIG), Indore, November 18–19, 2016, 1–5.
5. Deepjyoti Kalita, "Resource Description Capacity of Reference Management Software: A Case Study," *SALIS 2016: National Conference on Creativity, Innovation and Transformation in Libraries*, 2016, available online at <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324057209> [accessed 12 January 2021].
6. Amy Butros and Sally Taylor, "Managing Information: Evaluating and Selecting Citation Management Software a Look at Endnote, Refworks, Mendeley and Zotero," *International Association of Aquatic and Marine Science Libraries and Information Centers (36th: 2010: Mar del Plata, Argentina)*, 2011, available online at <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/268428881> [accessed 20 January 2022].