



**METHODOLOGY FOR OVERALL AND SUBJECT RANKINGS FOR THE
TIMES HIGHER EDUCATION WORLD UNIVERSITY RANKINGS 2016 –
2017**

September 2016



Times Higher Education World University Rankings:

The *Times Higher Education World University Rankings*, founded in 2004, aims to provide the definitive list of the world's best universities, evaluated across teaching, research, international outlook, reputation and more. Times Higher Education's (THE) data is trusted by governments and universities and is a vital resource for students, helping them choose where to study.

Directors' assertion:

*This document (the "Methodology") sets out our end-to-end process for generating the Times Higher Education World University Rankings 2016 – 2017 (the "Rankings"). As directors and management of Times Higher Education, we assert that we have followed our Methodology and correctly applied the "specific rules" denoted by (i) - (x) (highlighted in **bold underlined italics** throughout this document).*

Signed:

Print: *TREVOR BURGATT*

Role: *MANAGING DIRECTOR, TIMES HIGHER EDUCATION*

Date: *5/9/2016*

For and on behalf of TES Global Ltd

Independent assurance by PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP:

To help demonstrate the integrity of the Rankings, our application of the specific rules (i) - (x) has been subject to independent assurance by PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP UK ("PwC"). Their independent assurance opinion on our application of specific rules (i) – (x) is set out on the final page of this document. The specific rules (i) – (x) relate to:

- 1) **Data collection**
- 2) **Processing and exclusions**
- 3) **Ranking and scoring**
- 4) **Final reporting**

The specific rules (i) – (x) that have been independently assured by PwC are set out below in the table on page 10.

Important links:

- Times Higher Education 2016 - 2017 general rules --> <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/terms-and-conditions>
- World University Rankings 2016 - 2017 general overview --> <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/student/advice/world-university-rankings-explained>
- World University Rankings 2016 – 2017 World reputational rankings overview --> <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/world-reputation-rankings-2016-methodology>
- Times Higher Education World University Rankings 2016 – 2017 Methodology and PwC assurance opinion (this document) --> <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/methodology-world-university-rankings-2016-2017>

The *Times Higher Education World University Rankings* are the only global performance tables that judge research-intensive universities across all their core missions: teaching, research, knowledge transfer and international outlook. We use 13 carefully calibrated performance indicators, listed below, to provide comprehensive and balanced comparisons, trusted by students, academics, university leaders, industry and governments. The basic methodology for this year's rankings is similar to that employed since the 2011 – 2012 tables, but we made important changes to the underlying data sources notably deriving bibliometrics from Elsevier's Scopus database from 2015 – 2016 onwards.

The performance indicators are grouped into five areas:

- **Teaching** (the learning environment)
 - Reputation Survey – Teaching

- Staff-to-Student Ratio
- Doctorates Awarded / Bachelor Degrees Awarded
- Doctorates Awarded / Academic Staff
- Institutional Income / Academic Staff
- **Research** (volume, income and reputation)
 - Reputation Survey – Research
 - Research Income / Academic Staff
 - Publications / Academic Staff
- **Citations** (research influence)
 - Field Weighted Citation Impact
- **International outlook** (staff, students and research)
 - International to domestic students ratio
 - International to domestic staff ratio
 - International co-authorship
- **Industry income** (knowledge transfer)
 - Research income from industry / Academic Staff

1) Data collection

- a) Data sources and input
- b) Validation and resubmissions

1a) Data sources and input

- *Self-submitted data (portal)*

A named representative from each institution submits and authorises its institutional data for use in the rankings ⁽ⁱ⁾, via THE's designated online portal, with confirmations that they have:

- Provided true and accurate information for their institution for 2014; and
- Understood and complied with the THE terms and conditions --> <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/terms-and-conditions>;

In global terms, the most complete data available for all institutions has been found to be from 2 years ago, therefore all institutions report 2014 data.

Times Higher Education will not self-submit data for an institution without positive confirmation from the named representative of the institution ⁽ⁱⁱ⁾.

Prior to submission of data within the portal, the draft data undergoes automatic validation checks reviewed by the named representative ⁽ⁱⁱⁱ⁾.

- *Bibliometrics*

Citations data is a score per institution calculated by Elsevier from 2015 (until 2014 it was supplied by Web of Science). Elsevier provide the Field-Weighted Citation Impact (FWCI) score, per subject and overall.

The FWCI score indicates how the number of citations received by an entity's publications compares with the average number of citations received by all other similar publications. 'Similar publications' are understood to be publications in the Scopus database that have the same publication year, type, and discipline, as defined by the Scopus journal classification system.

An FCWI of 1.00 indicates the global average.

In 2015 – 2016 we excluded papers with more than 1,000 authors because they were having a disproportionate impact on the citation scores of the small number of universities. The year we have designed a methodology for re incorporating these papers using a new fractional counting approach that ensures that all universities where academics are authors of these papers will receive at least 5 per cent of the value of the paper. Where those that provide the most contributors to the paper receive a proportionately larger contribution.

We also collect the total number of publications overall, plus the total number of publications with international co-authorship per institution, providing they meet our 'sufficient publications' criteria (detailed in section 2a).

- Reputation survey

An annual survey was sent to a sample of academics randomly selected by Elsevier asking them to nominate the most important universities for Teaching and/or Research globally in their field. For the 2016 – 2017 survey, academics were asked to nominate the top 15 institutions for Teaching and the top 15 institutions for Research. The 2016 – 2017 survey was combined with the 2015 – 2016 survey for use in the Rankings.

The two Teaching and Research scores for an institution at the global level was the count of mentions they received in each category.

The two Teaching and Research scores relating to the specialist field of the survey respondents were the scores used for the subject tables. Where an institution received no votes, they were allocated a zero score.

- Reference data

THE incorporates reference datasets into its model to convert country-level data provided by institutions via the portal (e.g. research income in a local currency) to a single comparable dataset for all institutions.

The sources of this data are the HMRC monthly datasets:

[http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20141006110005/http://customs.hmrc.gov.uk/channelsPortalWebApp/channelsPortalWebApp.portal?nfpb=true&pageLabel=pageImportRatesCodesTools&propertyType=document&id=HMCE_PROD1_032973], which provides accurate foreign exchange rates to convert datasets into GBP and then back into their local currency if an institution reports in a foreign currency; and the World Bank Purchase Power Parity ("PPP") dataset [<http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/PA.NUS.PPP>] which is used to convert the local currency to common-PPP-scaled USD. PPP is used to exemplify the differing currency strengths in each country while allowing for easy cross country comparisons. Where data for a country doesn't exist in the World Bank database, a dataset from the IMF is used [<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2010/01/weodata/weosealgr.aspx>].

2) Processing and exclusions

- a) Criteria
- b) Subject ranking criteria
- c) Data point adjustments
- d) Data processing pre-rankings

2a) Criteria

Institutions must meet seven criteria in order to be included in the Overall Ranking (iv):

- i. **Sufficient publications** – An institution is required to publish more than 1000 papers over the previous 5 years, and more than 150 publications in any single year. Thresholds are also applied per subject for the subject rankings.
- ii. **Undergraduate students** – An institution must have more than zero undergraduate degrees awarded to be marked as valid. Postgraduate-only institutions are therefore not in the Rankings.
- iii. **Subject breadth** – An institution must not be focused on a single narrow subject area (more than 80% of their papers are from one subject area).
- iv. **Sufficient data in overall submission** – If an institution has not supplied any "overall" numbers for the ranking year they are excluded from the ranking.
- v. **Sufficient overall values** – If more than two of the critical overall values (academic staff, doctorates awarded, undergraduate degrees awarded, institutional income, students, international students, research income, research income industry and commerce, academic staff international) are null (either marked by the institution as "unavailable" or "withheld"), the institution is marked as invalid. Null values will cause any metric based on that value to also be null. Note that in exceptional circumstances, a "top 800" ranked institution which falls into this category may have their data manually sourced online (if available).

- vi. **At least one subject submission** – In addition to overall numbers, an institution must supply numbers for at least one applicable subject. If no applicable subjects have been reported, the institution is marked as invalid. An exception for this is if the institution in question is a “top 800” ranked institution, but only in exceptional circumstances. In such cases, refer to section 2c below.
- vii. **Not featured in custom exclusions list** – Institutions that have requested not to participate in the ranking or that are not eligible for other institution-specific reasons have been excluded.

2b) Subject ranking criteria

Publication eligibility criteria – For the eight subject tables, there is an additional threshold within the subject:

- At least 500 papers over 2011 – 2015 for subjects that generate a high volume of publications; and
- At least 250 papers over 2011 – 2015 in the social sciences, in the arts and humanities and in business and economics (where the volume tends to be lower).

Staff eligibility criteria – We also expect an institution to have at least 5% of its staff working in the relevant discipline, 4% for engineering and technology or 2% for computer science.

2c) Data adjustments

After the deadline of the submission of data via the Portal by institutions, ***THE management reviews and approves all institution submissions data for appropriateness and accuracy, based on prior year values and gaps within datasets***^(v) as described below.

Data points provided by institutions are reviewed and adjusted accordingly, in the following categories:

- i) Missing data values
- ii) Duplicates
- iii) Zeros

On the rare occasions when a particular data point is not provided – which affects only low-weighted indicators such as industrial income – a low estimate between the average value of the indicators and the lowest value reported (the 25th percentile of the other indicators) is entered. By doing this, an institution is not overly penalised with a “zero” value for data that it overlooks or does not provide, but equally is not rewarded for withholding data.

2d) Data processing pre-rankings

Data provided by institutions for financial information is converted into USD using international PPP exchange rates^(vi) (provided by the World Bank), for use in the Rankings calculations.

Institution-level bibliometric (Scopus) and reputation survey data obtained from Elsevier is mapped to THE institution data via THE’s institution ID^(vii).

3) Ranking and scoring

- a) Distribution analysis and re-weighting
- b) Subject ranking differentiation

3a) Distribution analysis and re-weighting

There are 13 indicators, each combined into 5 categories, or “pillars” which are weighted according to relative importance.

Once the final population of institutions and indicators has been prepared, the Rankings are generated by weighting the indicators ^(viii) according to the following percentage breakdowns:

1. Teaching (the learning environment): 30%

- Reputation survey: 15%
The Academic Reputation Survey (run annually) that underpins this category was carried out from January 2016 to March 2016. It examined the perceived prestige of institutions in teaching. The 2016 data are combined with the results of the 2015 survey. The responses were statistically representative of the global academy’s geographical and subject mix.
- Academic Staff-to-student ratio: 4.5%
- Doctorates awarded-to-bachelor’ degrees awarded ratio: 2.25%
- Doctorates awarded-to-academic staff ratio: 6%
As well as giving a sense of how committed an institution is to nurturing the next generation of academics, a high proportion of postgraduate research students also suggests the provision of teaching at the highest level that is thus attractive to graduates and effective at developing them. This indicator is normalised to take account of an institution’s unique subject mix, reflecting that the volume of doctoral awards varies by discipline.
- Institutional income: 2.25%
This measure of income is scaled against staff numbers and normalised for purchasing-power parity. It indicates an institution’s general status and gives a broad sense of the infrastructure and facilities available to students and staff.

2. Research (volume, income and reputation): 30%

- Reputation survey: 18%
The most prominent indicator in this category looks at an institution’s reputation for research excellence among its peers, based on the responses to our annual Academic Reputation Survey combining 2016 and 2015 data.
- Research income: 6%
Research income is scaled against academic staff numbers and adjusted for purchasing-power parity (PPP). This is a controversial indicator because it can be influenced by national policy and economic circumstances. But income is crucial to the development of world-class research, and because much of it is subject to competition and judged by peer review, our experts suggested that it was a valid measure. This indicator is normalised to take account of each institution’s distinct subject profile, reflecting the fact that research grants in science subjects are often bigger than those awarded for the highest-quality social science, arts and humanities research.
- Research productivity: 6%
We count the number of papers published in the academic journals indexed by Elsevier’s Scopus database per scholar, scaled for institutional size and normalised for subject. This gives a sense of the institution’s ability to get papers published in quality peer-reviewed journals.

3. Citations (research influence): 30%

Our research influence indicator looks at universities' role in spreading new knowledge and ideas.

We examine research influence by capturing the number of times a university's published work is cited by scholars globally. This year, our bibliometric data supplier Elsevier examined more than 83 million citations to 12.1 million journal articles, conference proceedings and books published over five years. The data include the 23,000 academic journals indexed by Elsevier's Scopus database and all indexed publications between 2011 and 2015. Citations to these publications made in the six years from 2011 to 2016 are also collected.

The citations help to show us how much each university is contributing to the sum of human knowledge: they tell us whose research has stood out, has been picked up and built on by other scholars and, most importantly, has been shared around the global scholarly community to expand the boundaries of our understanding, irrespective of discipline.

The data are normalised to reflect variations in citation volume between different subject areas. This means that institutions with high levels of research activity in subjects with traditionally high citation counts do not gain an unfair advantage.

We have blended equal measures of a country-adjusted and non-country-adjusted raw measure of citations scores.

In 2015-16, we excluded papers with more than 1,000 authors because they were having a disproportionate impact on the citation scores of a small number of universities. This year, we have designed a method for reincorporating these papers. Working with Elsevier, we have developed a new fractional counting approach that ensures that all universities where academics are authors of these papers will receive at least 5 per cent of the value of the paper, and where those that provide the most contributors to the paper receive a proportionately larger contribution.

4. International outlook (staff, students, research): 7.5%

- **International-to-domestic-student ratio:** 2.5%
- **International-to-domestic-staff ratio:** 2.5%
The ability of an institution to attract undergraduates, postgraduates and faculty from all over the world is key to its success on the world stage.
- **International collaboration:** 2.5%
In the third international indicator, we calculate the proportion of an institution's total research journal publications that have at least one international co-author and reward higher volumes. This indicator is normalised to account for an institution's subject mix and uses the same five-year window as the "Citations: research influence" category.

5. Industry income (knowledge transfer): 2.5%

An institution's ability to help industry with innovations, inventions and consultancy has become a core mission of the contemporary global academy. This category seeks to capture such knowledge-transfer activity by looking at how much research income an institution earns from industry (adjusted for PPP), scaled against the number of academic staff it employs.

The category suggests the extent to which businesses are willing to pay for research and an institution's ability to attract funding in the commercial marketplace – useful indicators of institutional quality.

3b) Subject ranking differentiation

The subject tables employ the same range of 13 performance indicators used in the overall World University Rankings, brought together with scores provided under the same five pillars:

- Teaching (the learning environment);
- Research (volume, income and reputation);
- Citations (research influence);
- International outlook (staff, students, research); and
- International collaboration.

However, within the subject rankings, the overall methodology is carefully recalibrated by subject, with the weightings changed to best suit the individual fields. In particular, those given to the research indicators have been altered to fit more closely the research culture in each subject, reflecting different publication habits: in the arts and humanities, for instance, where the range of outputs extends well beyond peer-reviewed journals, we give less weight to paper citations.

Accordingly, the weight given to “citations: research influence” is halved from 30% in the overall rankings to just 15% for the arts and humanities. More weight is given to other research indicators, including the Academic Reputation Survey. For social sciences, where there is also less faith in the strength of citations alone as an indicator of research excellence, the measure’s weighting is reduced to 25%.

By the same token, in those subjects where the vast majority of research outputs come through journal articles and where there are high levels of confidence in the strength of citations data, we have increased the weighting given to the research influence (up to 35% for the physical and life sciences and for the clinical, pre-clinical and health tables).

SUBJECT RANKINGS METHODOLOGY													
Indicator	Total students/ academic staff	PhD awards/ bachelor	PhD/Academic staff	Reputation Survey (teaching)	Institutional Income/ Academic staff	Scholarly papers/ Academic Staff	Research Income/ Academic Staff	Reputation Survey (research)	Citations: Research Impact	Income from Industry/ Academic Staff	Ratio of international to domestic staff	International co-authorship	Ratio of international to domestic students
	Teaching: The learning environment					Research: volume, income and reputation			Citations per paper	Industry income: innovation	International outlook		
ARTS & HUMANITIES													
Group weight	37.5					37.5			15	2.5	7.5		
Indicator weight	3.8	1.9	4.7	25.3	1.9	3.8	3.8	30	15	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
CLINICAL, PRE-CLINICAL & HEALTH, LIFE SCIENCES & PHYSICAL SCIENCES													
Group weight	27.5					27.5			35	2.5	7.5		
Indicator weight	2.8	1.4	4.1	17.9	1.4	4.1	4.1	19.3	35	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
ENGINEERING, TECHNOLOGY & COMPUTER SCIENCE													
Group weight	30					30			27.5	5	7.5		
Indicator weight	3	1.5	4.5	19.5	1.5	4.5	4.5	21	27.5	5	2.5	2.5	2.5
SOCIAL SCIENCE, BUSINESS & ECONOMICS													
Group weight	32.5					32.5			25	2.5	7.5		
Indicator weight	3.3	1.6	4.9	21.1	1.6	4.9	4.9	22.8	25	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5

Figures in the diagram above are rounded to one decimal place.

4) Final reporting

- a) Review of ranking outputs
- b) Sign off by management

4a) Review of ranking outputs

Getting to the final result

Moving from a series of specific data points to indicators, and finally to a total score for an institution, requires us to match values that represent fundamentally different data. To do this we use a standardisation approach for each indicator, and then combine the indicators in the proportions indicated below.

The standardisation approach we use is based on the distribution of data within a particular indicator, where we calculate a cumulative probability function, and evaluate where a particular institution's indicator sits within that function. A cumulative probability score of X in essence tells us that an institution with random values for that indicator would fall below that score X per cent of the time.

For all indicators except the Academic Reputation Survey, we calculate the cumulative probability function using a version of Z-scoring. The distribution of the data in the Academic Reputation Survey requires us to use an exponential component.

Once the individual indicators have been created for each institution, the results are combined into the overall rankings according to their relative weightings – this is the Main Rankings.

Once indicators and pillars have been calculated for each subject and overall, the results are used to calculate the Main Rankings ^(ix):

4b) Sign off by management

The Rankings calculations are reviewed by the editorial team, with comparisons in performance of institutions made to previous years. The Rankings are formally signed off by management prior to being uploaded to the website.

The specific rules for each Main Ranking are located on the Times Higher Education website at:

<https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/methodology-world-university-rankings-2016-2017>

The Main Rankings are subsequently reported on the THE website. ^(x)

Specific rules subject to independent assurance by PwC

Rule number	Methodology section	Rule description
(i)	Data collection	A named representative from each institution submits and authorises its institutional data for use in the rankings.
(ii)	Data collection	Times Higher Education will not self-submit data for an institution without positive confirmation from the named representative of the institution.
(iii)	Data collection	Prior to submission of data within the portal, the draft data undergoes automatic validation checks reviewed by the named representative.
(iv)	Processing and exclusions	Institutions must meet seven criteria in order to be included in the Overall Ranking.
(v)	Processing and exclusions	THE management reviews and approves all institution submissions data for appropriateness and accuracy, based on prior year values and gaps within datasets.
(vi)	Processing and exclusions	Data provided by institutions for financial information is converted into USD using international PPP exchange rates.
(vii)	Processing and exclusions	Institution-level bibliometric (Scopus) and reputation survey data obtained from Elsevier is mapped to THE institution data via THE's institution ID.
(viii)	Ranking and scoring	Once the final population of institutions and indicators has been prepared, the Rankings are generated by weighting the indicators.
(ix)	Final reporting	Once indicators and pillars have been calculated for each subject and overall, the results are used to calculate the Main Rankings.
(x)	Final reporting	The Main Rankings are subsequently reported on the THE website.



Independent assurance report to the directors of TES Global Limited for the Times Higher Education World University Rankings 2016 – 2017

This report is produced in accordance with the terms of our contract dated 22 April 2016 for the purpose of reporting to the directors of TES Global Ltd on our independent limited assurance engagement over the directors’ assertion that Times Higher Education (THE) management has correctly applied specific rules (i) – (x) within its methodology (the “Methodology”) in production of the Times Higher Education World University Rankings 2016 – 2017 (the “Rankings”).

Specific rules (i) – (x) relate to the following steps in the production of the Rankings:

- 1. Data collection**
- 2. Processing and exclusions**
- 3. Ranking and scoring**
- 4. Final reporting**

The directors’ assertion that THE management has correctly applied specific rules (i) – (x) is set out on page 2 of the accompanying Methodology.

Intended users and purpose

This report is prepared for, and only for, the directors of TES Global Limited, and solely for the purpose of reporting to them on their assertion that they have correctly applied the specific rules (i) – (x) of the Methodology and no other purpose. We do not, in giving our opinion, accept or assume responsibility (legal or otherwise) or accept liability for, or in connection with, any other purpose for which our report including the opinion may be used, or to any other person to whom our report is shown or into whose hands it may come, and no other persons shall be entitled to rely on our opinion.

We permit the disclosure of our report, in full only and in the company of the Methodology, to enable the directors to demonstrate that they have discharged their governance responsibilities by commissioning an independent assurance report over the application of the specific rules (i) – (x) of the Methodology, without assuming or accepting any responsibility or liability to any third parties on our part. To the fullest extent permitted by law, we do not accept or assume responsibility to anyone other than the directors of TES Global Limited for our work or this report save where terms are expressly agreed and with our prior consent in writing.

Respective responsibilities of the directors and PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP

The directors of TES Global Limited are responsible for establishing an appropriate Methodology and specific rules (available on the Times Higher Education website at <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/student/advice/world-university-rankings-explained> for conducting the Rankings and reporting the results on the Times Higher Education website.

It is our responsibility to examine the application of the specific rules (i) – (x), to form an independent conclusion based on our work and to report that conclusion to the directors.

Our approach

Our examination was conducted in accordance with ISAE 3000 (revised) *Assurance Engagements other than Audits and Reviews of Historical Financial Information* issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board.

We performed a limited assurance engagement, as defined in ISAE 3000 (revised). The objective of a limited assurance engagement is to enable us to state whether, on the basis of our procedures, anything has come to our attention that causes us to believe that the directors’ assertion that the Times Higher Education World University Rankings 2016 – 2017 process has been conducted in accordance with their Methodology is not fairly stated in all material respects.

We performed the following procedures:

- Examining the Methodology and specific rules (i) – (x) and assessing any key assumptions and limitations
- Obtaining an understanding of the third party surveys and data
- Assessment of adherence to specific rules (i) – (x) for:
 - Data collection;
 - Processing and exclusions;
 - Ranking and scoring; and
 - Final reporting.
- Confirming accurate reporting of institutions on the Main and Subject Rankings in the Times Higher Education website. The top 20 institutions have been reproduced in Appendix 1
- Enquiries of relevant management.

Inherent limitations

Our assurance procedures are limited to assessing the application of specific rules (i) – (x) and are subject to the following inherent limitations:

- Reliance has been placed on data obtained from third parties. These datasets include:
 - Scopus field weighted citation data for institutions provider by Elsevier (part of RELX Group);
 - Reputational survey response data provided by Elsevier (part of RELX Group);
 - PPP currency conversion figures for 2014 provided by the World Bank; and
 - Foreign exchange currency conversion rates provided by HMRC.
- Our responsibility is to assess the directors' assertion that management has followed specific rules (i) – (x) of the Methodology, not to comment on the actual rankings or results of the application of the Methodology.

Conclusion

Based on the results of our work, nothing has come to our attention that causes us to believe that the directors' assertion that TES Global Limited management has correctly applied specific rules (i) – (x) in producing the Times Higher Education World University Rankings 2016 – 2017 is not fairly stated in all material respects.



PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
Chartered Accountants
London, UK
05 September 2016

Appendix 1: Top 20 institutions in the Overall Rankings from the Times Higher Education World University Rankings 2016 – 2017

WUR 2016-17 Rank	WUR 2015-16 Rank	Institution Name	Country	Teaching	International Outlook	Research	Citations	Industry Income	Overall Score
1	2	University of Oxford	United Kingdom	89.6	94.5	99.1	99.2	62.5	95.0
2	1	California Institute of Technology	United States	95.5	63.4	95.7	99.8	90.8	94.3
3	3	Stanford University	United States	92.6	76.5	95.9	99.9	60.9	93.8
4	4	University of Cambridge	United Kingdom	90.6	92.4	97.2	96.8	50.4	93.6
5	5	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	United States	90.3	85.6	92.3	99.9	88.4	93.4
6	6	Harvard University	United States	87.5	77.9	98.3	99.7	47.3	92.7
7	7	Princeton University	United States	89.5	77.2	88.4	99.2	49.9	90.2
8	8	Imperial College London	United Kingdom	86.4	96.5	86.6	97.3	67.5	90.0
9	9	ETH Zurich – Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich	Switzerland	81.5	98.1	93.7	92.5	63.7	89.3
=10	13	University of California, Berkeley	United States	82.4	59.6	96.1	99.8	37.6	88.9
=10	10	University of Chicago	United States	88.1	67.8	89.1	99.1	37.7	88.9
12	12	Yale University	United States	88.5	64.3	87.8	97.8	44.5	88.2
13	17	University of Pennsylvania	United States	85.9	50.1	88.9	98.6	49.9	87.1
14	16	University of California, Los Angeles	United States	82.9	58.0	89.0	98.4	47.1	86.6
15	14	University College London	United Kingdom	77.4	94.3	90.0	94.0	41.9	86.5
16	15	Columbia University	United States	86.9	75.3	78.9	98.6	44.9	86.1
17	11	Johns Hopkins University	United States	77.4	71.1	84.3	98.4	100.0	85.9
18	20	Duke University	United States	80.7	58.2	80.0	98.8	100.0	84.7
19	18	Cornell University	United States	79.7	62.2	86.5	97.2	36.0	84.6
20	25	Northwestern University	United States	75.8	56.1	85.0	97.0	85.8	83.7