

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

Christophe Ley<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Luxembourg

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

This is an interesting paper, pointing indeed towards problems related to the H-index and, in general, the publishing culture. The paper is meant to be short, nevertheless some description of existing popular alternative proposals to the H-index would serve the paper well.

Concerning the new proposal here, I like the idea of bringing into the picture individual contributions and the number of authors. While the fact of giving more weight to the main author (if there is a main author) is good, I find the fact of ranking the other authors as arbitrary as the H-index. In a paper with 10 authors, say, how can one determine the contributions of authors who are not placed first, second and last (in case that these positions make at all sense in the concerned field)? So, this successive subtraction of the quantity  $x$  is too arbitrary and needs to be thought over. I concur with the author that a really good proposal can only be obtained by a consensus among publishers, who may have to ask, as some journals do, for concrete contributions to the paper, and then only could an index like the one proposed here make sense. This would require more time for a submission and, perhaps, slow down the ever-too-fast paper production process.

I would like to see how the author would adapt his proposal in this light.

Regarding the formulas, there is a small mistake in the first line of Box 1: it should not be  $[ny-(n-1)x]$  but  $[y-(n-1)x]$ .