A revised Excel Data Table for the NRC *Data-Based Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States* is now available. A summary of changes for each program can be found [here](http://sites.nationalacademies.org/pga/Resdoc/index.htm). Those who wish to compare the September 28, 2010 version of the Data Table to the revised rankings, may find the old rankings on our website at [http://sites.nationalacademies.org/pga/Resdoc/index.htm](http://sites.nationalacademies.org/pga/Resdoc/index.htm) under the Project Information tab.

The revisions are in response to communications and queries received by the NRC since the first Data Table was released on September 28, 2010. At that time, the NRC agreed to follow up on queries about the data and these were received from approximately 450 doctoral programs from 34 institutions. Ten of these institutions had queries for 10 or more of their programs.

The most common questions centered around faculty lists and related characteristics: publications per allocated faculty member, citations per publication, the allocation of faculty, and the measure of interdisciplinarity that used this measure. The NRC was not able to permit changes in faculty lists from what universities had originally submitted. That would have required enormous expense to completely redo the study with the 2005/6 data.

In the course of this process, the NRC discovered four substantive errors. These have been corrected and incorporated into re-calculated rankings. The variables that were affected are:

1) **Average Citations per Publication.** Publications for 2002 used to obtain citations per publication had been mislabeled in all non-humanities fields. 2002 publications were corrected, and the “citations per publication” variable (which is averaged over the years 2000 to 2006) was re-calculated.

2) **Awards per Allocated Faculty Member.** The NRC undercounted honors and awards. Data for this variable were re-compiled from faculty lists and the variable was re-calculated.

3) **Percent with Academic Plans.** The response rate to this question, which was calculated from the NSF Survey of Earned Doctorates, varied considerably across programs. It was agreed that a more accurate measure based on survey data was percent of respondents with academic positions or post-docs, not percent of total Ph.D.s. This variable was re-calculated with the changed definition.

4) **Percent of First-Year Students with Full Financial Support.** This variable had been given the value “0” when a program had no first year students. We now use an asterisk to indicate that a program has no first year students. When no data were reported, there is an "N/D".