

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

Janja Hojnik¹

¹ University of Maribor

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In my opinion, all contributions to review the system of academic evaluation are important. We all realize the system of relying on H-index has its shortcomings, including Mr Hirsch himself. It is just one index and should not be considered as something more. Proposals in the paper here are relevant, especially for pointing out the issue of co-authorship. Albeit it is true that not all disciplines accept certain order of co-authors, it is relevant that the paper points out the difference between a paper prepared by three and 20 people. This also points to the difference between research fields. We now have research fields where very often 200 people are written on a paper and fields where single authorship is still very frequent (history, law...). My view is that numbers will never show real scientific value of academic work. We need to accept that there are research fields or subfields or topics where no large academic community exists, but they are still important for the society. Not everybody should research cancer, where most citations are collected because of the large research community in this field. There are also research fields that are by nature more regional, so authors in those fields do not collect citations from all over the world and their h-index should not be compared to those fields that are truly global.