

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

Jiban K. Pal¹

¹ Indian Statistical Institute

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I am delighted to have this review work. The agenda of research is highly relevant that signifies its importance.

I have gone through the manuscript and I found that the author has pursued an intellectual effort in preparing the background context of this paper. It addresses the shortcomings of h-index based assessment of scientific performance taking (only) the number of citations into account, which does not reflect actual contribution of each author in the overall scientific production and the scientific quality of citing articles as well.

So a fairer criterion for measuring scientific achievements has been proposed using a workable and novel method... Thus he suggested considering the number of authors in a paper, their positions in the authors' list, and the weighted number of citations can provide a fairer proxy measure than the current practice of using h-index straightway. Obviously, such a proxy measure beyond the h-index would necessarily require a wide consensus among researchers (heads/ directors), funders, publishers, and other stakeholders.

In my opinion, the author imposed more likely the proportionate counting method (rather than using fractional counting) in the distribution of citation score that could be more complex to compute in typical situations of mega-authorship contributions. The linear score reduction for each subsequent author [denoted as 'x' in the $y+(y-x)+(y-2x)+(y-3x)+(y-4x)=z$] may not be true in real situation and can be criticized quite often. A rational justification in this regard alongside the weighting of citations based on the impact factors (IF) might be useful to enhance the readership value of this contribution.

However, an application of this proxy measure beyond the H-index would be an essential part of this contribution to get a better resolution with greater insights. A few computed scores combining the publications of multi and mega-authorships accumulating their citation values can be presented in a table. Indeed a few actionable statements can be given in the concluding remarks of this remarkable contribution. The novelty/significance of this study can be given clearly in the concluding remarks to enable an extra readership. These suggested changes might be useful to improve it further.

As I understand, the ideas incorporated in this manuscript would have far-reaching impact in the foreseeable future. It would be useful to scientific enterprises for developing research infrastructure and/or re-orientation of their practices.

Jiban K. Pal, PhD

