

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

Sanjoy Kar

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

The review work "Measuring researchers' success more fairly: going beyond the H-index" is a noteworthy and timely contribution to the field of research impact evaluation. The authors point out important limitations of the H-index, which is commonly used to evaluate researchers' scientific output. They propose a fresh approach to integrate various factors that have been neglected in the H-index, such as the individual contribution of each author, the number of authors, and the scientific quality of citing articles.

The article presents an innovative perspective on the assessment of research impact, which is not solely based on quantitative measures but includes qualitative judgments. However, the authors do not present a new measure or system for evaluating research impact, but instead suggest a framework for developing a better proxy measure based on merit. The arguments presented in the article are well-supported with relevant literature sources, but it could benefit from including more diverse perspectives on research impact evaluation and more recent literature sources.

The methodology employed in the article is appropriate and the arguments presented are built on a strong theoretical and conceptual foundation. The authors provide a clear example of how their proposed method can be used to assess researchers' scientific impact, although the article lacks empirical evidence to support the effectiveness of the proposed method.

The conclusions of the article adequately tie together the other elements of the paper and provide practical implications for research, practice, and society. The authors recognize the limitations of any proposed system and highlight the need for clear reasoning and consensus among publishers, researchers, and research funders. The article has the potential to influence public policy and research practices, but the authors could have provided more examples of how their proposed method could be used in practice and the potential economic and commercial impact it could have.

Overall, the article presents an original perspective on research impact evaluation and proposes a framework for developing a better proxy measure based on merit. The ideas presented in the paper are well-supported with relevant literature sources, but more diverse perspectives and empirical evidence to support the proposed method could improve the article.