**OBJECTIVE:** Develop a bibliometric method to quantify cross-disciplinary research activity.

**BACKGROUND**
- Growing recognition of value of cross-disciplinary research teams for innovation and translational research.
- Institutional investments in training and resources to promote team science.
- Methods needed to document and compare cross-disciplinary activities of individuals and groups within and across institutions.

**METHODS**
- 63 health sciences scholars selected.
- Research articles from Scopus used as evidence of scholars’ research activity.
- Departmental affiliations of authors used as indications of discipline.
- NIH “field of training” classification scheme modified to enable classification of all affiliations named in the corpus of scholars’ articles.
- Discipline count assigned to each article; average discipline count assigned to each author.

**RESULTS**
- Discipline counts permitted comparison of three peer groups who received NIH career development (“K”) awards 2005-2010. [manuscript submitted]

**DISCUSSION**
- Bibliographic data limitations require analysis by departmental affiliation rather than by training.
- Concept of “discipline” not strictly defined.
- Not a 1:1 relationship between individual and affiliation.
- Publications may include multiple affiliations per individual or none at all.
- Affiliations described differently in academic, clinical, governmental, and corporate institutions.
- Department names and author affiliations can change over time.
- Authors in fields such as computer science and engineering often publish research findings as conference papers (excluded from this analysis).
- NIH classification oriented towards clinical medicine. Modified scheme accentuates this bias due to disciplines represented in scholars’ articles.

**IMPLICATIONS**
- Discipline classification of author affiliations complements existing methods of describing cross-disciplinary research activity, including:
  - Journal discipline classification.
  - Citation analyses.
  - Network analyses.
- Method could be improved through development of a consensus classification scheme.