



Independent Limited Assurance Report to the Management Board of Association of rating, ranking and other performance evaluations makers

Introduction

This report is produced in accordance with the terms of our contract dated 19 March 2018 for the purpose of reporting to the Management Board of Association of rating, ranking and other performance evaluations makers (hereinafter - "ARM") on our independent limited assurance engagement over the specific procedures (i) – (xiv) (hereinafter – "the Procedures") applied by ARM in preparation and reporting of the pilot Moscow International University Ranking "The three university missions" 2017 (hereinafter – the "Ranking"), listed on page 5 of the Methodology attached as Appendix 1 to the Management Board's statement.

Our Qualified Conclusion

Based on the results of our work, except for the potential effect of the matters described in the Basis for Qualified Conclusion section of our report, nothing has come to our attention that causes us to believe that the Procedures have not been properly applied in all material respects.

Basis for Qualified Conclusion

We have obtained the data on:

- normalised Citation Impact according to Web of Science (global and national levels),
- total number of online courses on the global online platforms Coursera and edX,
- total pages of universities' websites indexed by search engines (Google, Baidu, Yandex),

used by ARM in the metrics calculations. However, the data used in calculations was extracted from the above web resources as of October 2017 and had changed by the time of our procedures, therefore we were unable to confirm the reliability of the data used in the respective Procedures.

Professional Standards Applied and Level of Assurance

We performed a limited assurance engagement in accordance with International Standard on Assurance Engagements 3000 (Revised) 'Assurance Engagements other than Audits and Reviews of Historical Financial Information' issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board.

Our Independence and Quality Control

We have complied with the independence and other ethical requirements of the Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants issued by the International Ethics Standards Board for Accountants, which is founded on fundamental principles of integrity, objectivity, professional competence and due care, confidentiality and professional behaviour, together with the ethical requirements of the Auditor's Professional Ethics Code and Auditor's Independence Rules that are relevant to our assurance procedures in the Russian Federation.

Our firm applies International Standard on Quality Control 1 and accordingly maintains a comprehensive system of quality control including documented policies and procedures regarding compliance with ethical requirements, professional standards and applicable legal and regulatory requirements.



Inherent Limitations

Our work was limited to assessing the application of the Procedures and is subject to the inherent limitation of placing reliance on data sets obtained from third parties or publicly available. These data sets include:

- Data on winners of student competitions (Procedure (iv));
- Data published on the universities websites (Procedure (v)) or provided within the survey (Procedure (i));
- PPP currency conversion figures provided by the World Bank and OECD (Procedure (vi));
- Data on winners of IREG awards (Procedure (vii));
- Scopus normalised citation data for institutions provided by Elsevier (Procedure (viii));
- Web of Science bibliometric data extracted from the system (Procedure (ix));
- Number of online courses available on Coursera and edX (Procedure (x));
- Data provided by National research Tomsk state University (Procedure (xi)).

Work Performed

We have performed a limited assurance engagement over the Procedures. Our work has been performed in accordance with the agreement between us dated 19 March 2018.

Our limited assurance procedures primarily comprised:

- making enquiries of ARM's management;
- examining the Procedures and assessing any key assumptions and limitations;
- obtaining an understanding of the third party data and publicly available data;
- assessing adherence to the Procedures for:
 - inclusion of universities in the Ranking (i) - (iii) via re-performance of ARM's data model;
 - mapping of universities between data sets by university name and ID (iv)-(v), (vii)-(xi) through testing a sample of 30 universities;
 - calculation, normalisation and weighting of individual metric indicators into total scores (vi), (xii), (xiii) via re-performance of ARM's data model;
- confirming accurate reporting of universities in the Final Rankings on the MosIUR website (xiv).

Our responsibility is to assess the Management Board's statement that management has applied the Procedures and not to comment on the appropriateness of the Methodology itself.

The Ranking has been reproduced in Appendix 2 to the Management Board's statement.

A limited assurance engagement is substantially less in scope than a reasonable assurance engagement under ISAE 3000 and involves less detailed testing.



ARM's Responsibilities

The management of ARM is responsible for:

- establishing an appropriate Methodology and specific procedures for preparing the Ranking and reporting the results on MosIUR's website;
- designing, implementing and monitoring processes and controls and execution of activities to properly apply the Procedures;
- supporting the Management Board's Statement with sufficient evidence, including supporting documentation; and
- the maintenance and integrity of MosIUR's website.

Our Responsibilities

We are responsible for:

- planning and performing the engagement to obtain sufficient and appropriate evidence to support our assurance conclusion;
- forming an independent assurance conclusion, based on the procedures we have performed and the evidence we have obtained, on the Management Board's Statement over their application of the Procedures; and
- reporting our conclusion to the Management Board of ARM.

We believe that the evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our conclusion.

Intended Users and Purpose

This report is prepared for, and only for, the Management Board of ARM, and solely for the purpose of reporting to them on their statement that they had followed the Methodology and properly applied the Procedures and for no other purpose. We do not, in giving our conclusion, accept or assume responsibility (legal or otherwise) or accept liability for, or in connection with, any other purpose for which our report including the conclusion 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 conclusion.



We permit the disclosure of our report, in full only and accompanied by the Methodology, to enable the Management Board to demonstrate that they have discharged their governance responsibilities by commissioning an independent assurance report over the Procedures, 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 Management Board of ARM for our work or for this report save where terms are expressly agreed and with our prior consent in writing.

AO PricewaterhouseCoopers Audit

17 May 2018

Moscow, Russian Federation



A.S. Ivanov, certified auditor (licence no. 01-000531), AO PricewaterhouseCoopers Audit

Audited entity: Association of rating, ranking and other performance evaluations makers

Certificate of inclusion in the Unified State Register of Legal Entities issued on 27 March 2015 under registration № 1157700004109

119180, Moscow, B. Polyanka str., 7/10, bld. 3, s. 2, room 17.

Independent auditor: AO PricewaterhouseCoopers Audit

State registration certificate № 008.890, issued by the Moscow Registration Chamber on 28 February 1992

Certificate of inclusion in the Unified State Register of Legal Entities issued on 22 August 2002 under registration № 1027700148431

Member of Self-regulated organization of auditors «Russian Union of auditors» (Association)

ORNZ 11603050547 in the register of auditors and audit organizations

Management Board's Statement:

The document attached as Appendix 1 to the Statement (the "Methodology") sets out our end-to-end process for generating the pilot Moscow International University Ranking "The three university missions" 2017 (the "Ranking"). As management of ARM, we state that we have followed the Methodology and properly applied the specific procedures (i) - (xiv) listed on page 5 therein (the "Procedures").

17 May 2018

Grishankov D.E., General Director
On behalf of ARM Management Board



Independent assurance by AO PricewaterhouseCoopers Audit

To help demonstrate the integrity of the Ranking, our application of the Procedures has been subject to independent assurance by AO PricewaterhouseCoopers Audit ("PwC"), who have formed an independent assurance conclusion thereon. The Procedures relate to:

- 1) **Selection of participants**
- 2) **Data collection, processing and exclusions**
- 3) **Ranking and scoring**
- 4) **Final reporting**

Important links:

MosIUR methodology >> <https://mosiur.org/methods/methodology/>

World University Rankings 2017 >> <https://mosiur.org/ranking/>

Appendix 1

The Three University Missions Pilot Ranking Methodology (December 2017)

Moscow International University Ranking is a fundamentally new academic ranking, the first to evaluate all the three key university missions: education, research, and interaction with society. The ranking uses a number of new criteria calculated on the basis of objective data, and does not use any subjective reputation surveys. The initiative of creating the ranking has been supported by leading universities of Russia, China, India, Iran, Japan, and Turkey.

The ranking methodology has had a wide public discussion in Russia and abroad. The first draft of the Moscow International University Ranking methodology has been developed as a result of a wide public discussion with a total of over 100 collective contributors: universities, rector councils, expert associations, and rating agencies.

The performance indicators are grouped into three areas:

Education:

1. Wins in International Student Contests by Students
2. International students to overall student headcount ratio
3. University budget to student ratio
4. Student to academic staff ratio

Research:

5. IREG List awards won by university academic staff and alumni
6. Normalised Citation Impact (global level), according to Scopus
7. Normalised Citation Impact (global level), according to Web of Science
8. Normalised Citation Impact (national level), according to Scopus
9. Normalised Citation Impact (national level), according to Web of Science
10. Research income per academic staff member
11. Field-weighted views impact (according to Scopus)

University & Society:

12. University's online courses published on the biggest global online platforms
13. University's share in its country's total university publications
14. Total pages of a university's website indexed by biggest search engines
15. University's Wikipedia page views
16. University's Twitter account followers
17. University's alumni with an individual article on Wikipedia

The overall weight of indicators per group is: 45% for Education, 25% for Research, and 30% for University and Society.

1) Selection of participants

The short list of universities which had been processed for the rankings calculation was formed as follows:

- a) Top 100 universities from Times Higher Education World University Ranking 2017
- b) Top 100 universities from QS World University Ranking 2017
- c) Top universities selected by the expert board from IREG Inventory of National Rankings available within the period of short list assessment
- d) Universities that expressed the desire to participate in the assessment
- e) Universities with a high number of publications in Web of Science from the countries where IREG national rating is absent (Austria, Israel, Iceland, Spain, Norway, France)
- f) Exclusion of narrow-focused universities, i.e. those without educational programmes in at least two of six areas of knowledge according to the OECD classification
- g) Exclusion of universities with significant lack of data for assessment.

2) Data collection, processing and exclusions

The following data was collected from the different sources and used in the assessment:

2a) Wins in International Student Contests by Students

Data on individual and team wins in the following 12 international student contests from 2013 to 2017 was obtained from the web sites of the contests:

- ACM International Collegiate Programming Contest
- The Philip C. Jessup International Law Moot Court Competition
- The World Universities Debating Championships
- SIAM Student Paper Competition & SIAM Student Paper Prizes
- International Mathematics Competition for University Students
- Network of International Business Schools Worldwide Case & Business Plan Competitions
- Green Brain of the Year Contest
- The University Physics Competition
- McGill Management International Case Competition
- The Mathematical Contest in Modeling
- John Molson Undergraduate Case Competition
- Belgrade Business International Case Competition

Each contest was given a weight depending on the number of countries covered (ACM ICPC, which brings together students from over 100 countries, has the maximum weight, 1.00; Belgrade Business International Case Competition with participants from as few as 9 countries has a weight of 0.09). The weighted values for each university were then added together to make the university's score.

2b) Number of students, number of international students, university budget, research income and number of academic staff

The respective data was obtained from the universities' websites and questionnaires filled by the universities under the voluntary survey process. Financial data was converted into USD at PPP defined by OECD (in case the necessary value not present, the World Bank PPP was used).

2c) IREG List awards won by university academic staff and alumni

Data on awards from the IREG List of International Academic Awards a university's staff and alumni won during the period from 1997 to 2017 was obtained from the websites of the respective awards:

- Kyoto Prize in Basic Sciences
- Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine
- Crafoord Prize in Astronomy
- Nobel Prize in Chemistry
- Crafoord Prize in Geosciences
- The Abel Prize
- Fields Medal
- Nobel Prize in Physics

- Kyoto Prize in Advanced Technology
- M. Turing Award
- The Global Energy Prize
- Tyler Prize for Environmental Achievement
- The Sveriges Riksbank Prize in Economic Sciences in Memory of Alfred Nobel
- The Stockholm Prize in Criminology
- The Johan Skytte Prize in Political Science
- The Stein Rokkan Prize for Comparative Social Science Research

Only permanent university staff members as of the date of prize giving were considered. Alumni included those who had successfully completed a programme that leads to a degree of Bachelor, Master, PhD, and equivalent degrees.

Each prize was given the weight defined by IREG Observatory on Academic Rankings and Excellence, the biggest association of academic ranking compilers and users (Nobel Prizes have the maximum weight of 1.00). The weighted values for each university were then added together to make the university's score.

2d) Normalised Citation Impact according to Scopus (global and national levels)

The data was obtained from Elsevier. Papers published during the period from 2012 to 2015 were considered. The normalised citation impact is calculated separately for six broad areas of knowledge according to OECD classification: Natural Sciences, Engineering and Technology, Medical Sciences, Agricultural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities). The scores gained in each area of knowledge were then added together to make the university's score. The national level university's normalised citation impact was assessed as impact to its country's respective value is calculated. The scores gained in each area of knowledge were then added together to make the university's score. Values below the threshold equal to 12% of median were excluded from the calculations.

2e) Normalised Citation Impact according to Web of Science (global and national levels)

The data was extracted through InCites widget provided by Clarivate Analytics. Papers published during the period from 2012 to 2015 were considered. The normalised citation impact is calculated separately for six broad areas of knowledge according to OECD classification: Natural Sciences, Engineering and Technology, Medical Sciences, Agricultural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities). The scores gained in each area of knowledge were then added together to make the university's score. The national level university's normalised citation impact was assessed as impact to its country's respective value is calculated. The scores gained in each area of knowledge were then added together to make the university's score. Values below the threshold equal to 20% of average number of publications were excluded from the calculations.

2f) University's online courses published on the biggest global online platforms

The data on total number of online courses was obtained from the global online platforms Coursera and edX. The data was assessed as of October 2017.

2g) Total pages of a university's website indexed by biggest search engines

The data was extracted from the search engines (Google, Baidu, Yandex) for the period 11 September – 4 October 2017. The highest value out of the three engines was used in the assessment.

2h) University's Wikipedia page views, Twitter account followers and alumni with an individual article on Wikipedia

The data was extracted by the external supplier - National Research Tomsk State University in the period from 15 September – 2 October 2017.

Total number of university alumni with an individual page on Wikipedia meeting the threshold values: alumnus date of birth: not earlier than 1947; page views: at least 1000 in 12 months before the date of calculation (September 2017). Thus, the pages which are not often visited by the users, are excluded from calculation.

3) Ranking and scoring

3a) Calculation of metrics

In case linear calculation of scores was impracticable, a normalisation method was used to make the

distribution of evaluations more even. In particular, the normalisation of data using Box-Cox method was used for the following criteria scoring:

- University budget to student ratio
- Student to academic staff ratio
- Field-weighted views impact (according to Scopus)
- University's Twitter account followers

3b) Weightings of metrics to final scores

The above 17 performance metrics representing the three areas are weighted according to ARM's assessment of relative importance.

The scores gained by higher education institutions in each of the indicators were multiplied by the respective indicator coefficients. The weighted scores in each of the indicators were then added together to make the university's score:

Area	Indicator	Weight, %
Education (45%)	1) Wins in International Student Contests by Students	5%
	2) International students to overall student headcount ratio	10%
	3) University budget to student ratio	15%
	4) Student to academic staff ratio	15%
Research (25%)	5) IREG List awards won by university academic staff and alumni	5%
	6) Normalised Citation Impact (global level), according to Scopus	5%
	7) Normalised Citation Impact (global level), according to Web of Science	5%
	8) Normalised Citation Impact (national level), according to Scopus	1%
	9) Normalised Citation Impact (national level), according to Web of Science	1%
	10) Research income per academic staff member	5%
	11) Field-weighted views impact (according to Scopus)	3%
University & Society (30%)	12) University's online courses published on the biggest global online platforms	6%
	13) University's share in its country's total university publications	4%
	14) Total pages of a university's website indexed by the biggest search engines	4%
	15) University's Wikipedia page views	2%
	16) University's Twitter account followers	2%
	17) University's alumni with an individual article on Wikipedia	12%

4) Final reporting

The Ranking is listed together with the Methodology on the MosiUR website at >> <https://mosiur.org/ranking/>

Specific procedures for the Rankings 2017 subject to independent assurance by PwC

	Methodology section	Procedure description
(i)	Selection of participants	Execution of a survey of Russian universities
(ii)	Selection of participants	Collection of data on THE WUR, QS WUR and IREG Inventory of National Rankings
(iii)	Selection of participants	Formation of the short list of universities: a) Top 100 universities from THE WUR 2017 b) Top 100 universities from QS WUR 2017 c) Top universities selected by the expert board from IREG Inventory of National Rankings available within the period of short list assessment d) Universities that expressed the desire to participate in the assessment e) Universities with a high number of publications in Web of Science from the countries where IREG national rating is absent (Austria, Israel, Iceland, Spain, Norway, France) f) Exclusion of narrow-focused universities, i.e. those without educational programmes in at least two of 6 areas of knowledge according to the OECD classification g) Exclusion of universities with significant lack of data for assessment
(iv)	Data collection, processing and exclusions	Collection of data from websites of international contests on wins in International Student Contests by Students from the short list
(v)	Data collection, processing and exclusions	Collection of data from university websites on Number of students, number of international students, university budget, research income and number of academic staff
(vi)	Data collection, processing and exclusions	Conversion of financial data into PPP defined by OECD (in case the necessary value not present, the World Bank PPP was used)
(vii)	Data collection, processing and exclusions	Collection of data from websites of IREG List awards won by university academic staff and alumni
(viii)	Data collection, processing and exclusions	Obtaining data from Elsevier on normalised Citation Impact according to Scopus (global and national levels)
(ix)	Data collection, processing and exclusions	Extracting data on normalised Citation Impact according to according to Web of Science (global and national levels) through inCites widget.
(x)	Data collection, processing and exclusions	Collection of data on total number of online courses from the global online platforms Coursera and edX
(xi)	Data collection, processing and exclusions	Extraction of data from the search engines (Google, Baidu, Yandex) on total pages of a university's website indexed. Placing the order for extraction of data on university's wikipedia page views, twitter account followers and alumni with an individual article on wikipedia to external supplier and collection of the respective data.
(xii)	Ranking and scoring	Normalisation of data and calculation of metrics
(xiii)	Final reporting	Weightings of metrics to final scores (the overall weight of indicators per group is: 45% for Education, 25% for Research, and 30% for University and Society.)
(xiv)	Final reporting	Publication of final ranking on MosIUR website.

Appendix 2

Moscow International University Ranking “The Three University Missions”: Final Results

Rank	University name	Country
1	Harvard University	United States
2	Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)	United States
3	Stanford University	United States
4	Yale University	United States
5	University of Cambridge	United Kingdom
6	University of Oxford	United Kingdom
7	University of Michigan	United States
8	Johns Hopkins University	United States
9	École polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL)	Switzerland
10	Princeton University	United States
11	University of Tokyo	Japan
12	Columbia University	United States
13	Imperial College London	United Kingdom
14	University of Chicago	United States
15	California Institute of Technology (Caltech)	United States
16	University of Pennsylvania	United States
17	ETH Zurich	Switzerland
18	Cornell University	United States
19	Duke University	United States
20	University of California, Berkeley	United States
21	University of California, San Diego (UCSD)	United States
22	University College London	United Kingdom
23	King's College London	United Kingdom
24	University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA)	United States
25	Lomonosov Moscow State University	Russia
26	Washington University in St. Louis	United States
27	The University of Manchester	United Kingdom
28	National University of Singapore (NUS)	Singapore
29	Kyoto University	Japan
30	Northwestern University	United States
31	Georgia Institute of Technology	United States
32	Nanyang Technological University, Singapore (NTU)	Singapore
33	Peking University	China
34	Karolinska Institute	Sweden
35	Boston University	United States
36	London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE)	United Kingdom

Rank	University name	Country
37	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	United States
38	University of Geneva	Switzerland
39	Emory University	United States
40	Rice University	United States
41	University of Washington	United States
42	Heidelberg University	Germany
43	École normale supérieure, Paris	France
44	École Polytechnique	France
45	New York University	United States
46	University of Wisconsin-Madison	United States
47	Dartmouth College	United States
48	The University of Edinburgh	United Kingdom
49	The Australian National University	Australia
50	The Chinese University of Hong Kong	China/Hong Kong
51	University of Sydney	Australia
52	University of Toronto	Canada
53	University of Pittsburgh	United States
54	University of Copenhagen	Denmark
55	University of Zurich	Switzerland
56	University of Bristol	United Kingdom
57	The University of Warwick	United Kingdom
58	Wageningen University & Research	Netherlands
59	Carnegie Mellon University	United States
60	Delft University of Technology	Netherlands
61	University of Southern California	United States
62	University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	United States
63	University of Basel	Switzerland
64	University of Maryland, College Park	United States
65	University of Tübingen	Germany
66	Radboud University Nijmegen	Netherlands
67	University of Amsterdam	Netherlands
68	Tohoku University	Japan
69	Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT)	Germany
70	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	United States
71	Uppsala University	Sweden
72	Saint Petersburg State University	Russia
73	Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology	Russia
74	Maastricht University	Netherlands
75	The University of Melbourne	Australia
76	The University of Sheffield	United Kingdom

Rank	University name	Country
77	University of California, Irvine	United States
78	Nagoya University	Japan
79	Fudan University	China
80	The University of Hong Kong	China/Hong Kong
81	University of St Andrews	United Kingdom
82	Charles University	Czech Republic
83	Ludwig-Maximilian University of Munich	Germany
84	Trinity College Dublin	Ireland
85	Shanghai Jiao Tong University	China
86	University of Oslo	Norway
87	University of Alberta	Canada
88	University of California, Davis	United States
89	Aarhus University	Denmark
90	University of British Columbia	Canada
91	Brown University	United States
92	RWTH Aachen University	Germany
93	Pennsylvania State University	United States
94	University of Freiburg	Germany
95	Erasmus University Rotterdam	Netherlands
96	The Ohio State University	United States
97	Pohang University of Science and Technology (POSTECH)	South Korea
98	University of Glasgow	United Kingdom
99	University of Southampton	United Kingdom
100	KU Leuven	Belgium
101	Université Pierre et Marie Curie (UPMC)	France
102	Free University of Berlin	Germany
103	University of Science and Technology of China	China
104	Osaka University	Japan
105	National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM)	Mexico
106	Tsinghua University	China
107	National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE)	Russia
108	University of California, Santa Barbara	United States
109	Utrecht University	Netherlands
110	University of Nottingham	United Kingdom
111	Keio University	Japan
112	The University of Queensland	Australia
113	Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST)	South Korea
114	University of Helsinki	Finland
115	Technical University of Munich	Germany
116	Leiden University	Netherlands

Rank	University name	Country
117	Waseda University	Japan
118	The University of Auckland	New Zealand
119	Korea University	South Korea
120	KTH Royal Institute of Technology	Sweden
121	Tokyo Institute of Technology	Japan
122	University of São Paulo (USP)	Brazil
123	University of Groningen	Netherlands
124	University of Leeds	United Kingdom
125	All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi (AIIMS)	India
126	McGill University	Canada
127	Pontifical University of Chile (PUC)	Chile
128	Vienna University of Technology	Austria
129	Lund University	Sweden
130	University of Birmingham	United Kingdom
131	National Research Nuclear University MEPhI	Russia
132	Novosibirsk State University	Russia
133	Seoul National University	South Korea
134	The University of New South Wales (UNSW Sydney)	Australia
135	The Hebrew University of Jerusalem	Israel
136	Tomsk Polytechnic University	Russia
137	The University of Western Australia	Australia
138	National Taiwan University	Taiwan
139	The University of Chile	Chile
140	Zhejiang University	China
141	National University of Ireland, Galway (NUI Galway)	Ireland
142	Kyushu University	Japan
143	Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore	India
144	University College Dublin	Ireland
145	University of Cape Town	South Africa
146	University of Witwatersrand	South Africa
147	Okayama University	Japan
148	Xian Jiao Tong University	China
149	Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST)	China/Hong Kong
150	University of Waterloo	Canada
151	Humboldt University of Berlin	Germany
152	Technical University of Berlin	Germany
153	Monterrey Institute of Technology and Higher Education (ITESM)	Mexico
154	University of Texas at Austin	United States
155	Hiroshima University	Japan
156	Autonomous University of Barcelona (UAB)	Spain

Rank	University name	Country
157	Toyota Technological Institute	Japan
158	University of Warsaw	Poland
159	Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS)	Brazil
160	Durham University	United Kingdom
161	Monash University	Australia
162	Nanjing University	China
163	University of Vienna	Austria
164	Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur	India
165	Universidad Complutense de Madrid (UCM)	Spain
166	El Colegio de México	Mexico
167	Sungkyunkwan University (SKKU)	South Korea
168	Belarusian State University	Belarus
169	Istanbul University	Turkey
170	Tehran University of Medical Sciences	Iran
171	Purdue University	United States
172	Beijing Normal University	China
173	Peter the Great St. Petersburg Polytechnic University	Russia
174	University of Buenos Aires (UBA)	Argentina
175	National Tsing Hua University	Taiwan
176	Tomsk State University	Russia
177	McMaster University	Canada
178	University College Cork	Ireland
179	National Cheng Kung University	Taiwan
180	University of Victoria	Canada
181	Jagiellonian University in Krakow	Poland
182	National Polytechnic Institute, Mexico	Mexico
183	Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ)	Brazil
184	Université de Montréal	Canada
185	City University of Hong Kong	China/Hong Kong
186	Middle East Technical University	Turkey
187	University of Bologna	Italy
188	University of Rome Tor Vergata	Italy
189	Simon Fraser University	Canada
190	Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi	India
191	Dublin City University	Ireland
192	Moscow State Institute of International Relations	Russia
193	Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv	Ukraine
194	Kazan Federal University	Russia
195	Ural Federal University	Russia
196	University of Iceland	Iceland

Rank	University name	Country
197	Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (RANEPA)	Russia
198	Sun Yat-sen University (SYSU)	China
199	Masaryk University	Czech Republic
200	Indian Institute of Technology, Roorkee	India