emerging economies, and the dominance of leadership as a primary research emphasis. Similarly, Wiid, du Preez, and Wallström (2012) performed an analysis of *Marketing Intelligence and Planning* to identify major author patterns and content trends in the field of marketing, highlighting the location of key authors and the productivity of regions in generating new scholarship. Such work can prove useful in encouraging a shared perspective and identifying areas of need within a subject or discipline. The present paper represents an attempt at a similar analysis in the domain of KO.

Efforts to Assess the KO Community

Previous studies of KO have addressed questions relating to the field's geographic reach and intellectual focus. Zhao and Wei (2017), for example, study collaborations among Chinese authors in KO from 1992 through 2016. In examining 1,298 articles with Chinese authors published in Web of Science Core Collection KO journals, they find an increase in collaborations over the period of study, including in international collaborations (from 50% in1992 to 92.53% in 2016). Likewise, Smiraglia (2015) investigates the field to evaluate the work being done in the area of domain analysis, a unique area of study covered in KO. Beyond KO, scholars in LIS have studied the international contributions to the *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* (JASIST) and in the *Journal of Documentation* (He and Spink 2002) over a fifty-year period at the time when electronic journals were changing the scholarly communication landscape. Analyzing first author affiliations only, these authors report that international contributions increased over the time of study (1950-1999) for both journals. The extent to which KO mirrors the broader discipline or represents a distinct area with unique or distinctive scholarly characteristics in its corpus remains an open question.

Metrics to Assess Countries, Comparatively

Broad estimates of global expenditure on research suggests where scholarly efforts are most actively pursued, and it's perhaps not surprising that in 2017 the US and Europe accounted for over 45% of annual spending on research and development, with China accounting for a further 22% (Statista 2019). These proportions correlate with the existence and growth of universities globally, though the US continues to dominate regional presence within top research university rankings. Domain or disciplinary differences, though more difficult to determine, also exist and are likely to reflect national and political emphases on research. Chinese universities, for example, are becoming highly ranked in engineering and computer science but less so on liberal arts, which remain dominated by US and European, particularly British, institutions.

Global rankings and expenditures are somewhat limited measures, and we recognize that scholars can, depending on their circumstances, be mobile, gravitating toward and succeeding at institutions that allow for them to investigate questions of interest using the methods that are most applicable. Further, we must acknowledge that scholarship in different countries varies in its reward and recognition, and political and economic support from the public and private sectors. Given the range and the regional differences in support and emphasis for particular research, it is interesting to consider where KO scholarship is situated and how it is distributed and enacted globally.