

Review of: "Measuring researchers' success more fairly: going beyond the H-index"

Yulye Jessica Romo Ramos

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. Proofing would improve overall flow and make it easier to read.
2. The first two points about current shortcomings of citations is duplicative. Both talk about the contribution of each author to a given article, whether it is due to their role in it or the number of people involved. I would recommend to merge.
3. I find problematic the idea that some journals are deemed more scientifically rigorous than others, particularly since the one this article is being published is not one of those. I would recommend to remove this point from both shortcomings or current practice list and from the proposed new way of measuring impact. It does not recognise the move towards open access and new review processed like that used by Qeios.
4. It seems like proposed algorithm does not work well with publications where authors are listed in alphabetical order.
5. Finally, I am not sure this article is moving the conversation towards a better understanding of research quality and impact beyond the limited current quantitative approach or how research funders are assessing research excellence.