

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

Matúš Medo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Fribourg

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper proposes a novel variation of the well-known H-index. There are, of course, many reasons why the H-index needs to be improved. The H-index has become so widespread mainly because it was the first metric of its kind as well as for its simplicity and interpretability.

At the same time, many variations of the H-index have been proposed in the past, and the present paper mentions only few of them. Even more importantly, there have been variations that have a similar goal of taking into account the papers' numbers of authors (entering "h-index fractional citations" in Google Scholar immediately reveals papers that are clearly relevant). A more thorough review of past achievements would add greatly to this paper's motivation.

My main problem with this paper is that it is not really a scientific paper as it does not attempt to validate/falsify its contribution. A novel variant of the H-index is proposed but it is not tested in any way, nor compared with the existing variants (and the H-index itself). That is a big problem because without knowing if and how it works, the readers have little reasons to take this paper's contribution seriously. A good motivation alone is not enough.