

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

Seena Fazel<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Oxford

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

It is important for evaluation of individual researchers to move beyond one metric. This article suggests moving beyond the h-index, and proposes a 4-fold approach. There are some limitations in this approach that need addressing.

1. Order of authors. This will differ by discipline - and a simple weighting by author order does not work. For example, the senior author in many disciplines is the last, and the penultimate author is considered to be a relatively high ranking - and higher than those authors who are 3rd and after for example. In psychology, 2nd author is typically considered senior author. Further, senior author may have as much/more weight in terms of overall contribution than first author - as it is the person who may have conceived of the project idea, applied for and secured funding, and supervised the various individuals on the research team, including co-drafting of the manuscript and responding to peer review comments.
2. Using impact factor in any scoring scheme is very problematic in the last couple of years as some journals have increased their IF considerably due to covid-related publications. There is more dispersion of IFs as a consequence that may reflect the relative number of these papers.
3. the composite score proposed by Ioannidis needs to be considered in more detail as it offers an alternative that has attracted substantial interest (<https://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.1002501>).

We have considered its application to psychiatry, psychology and the neurosciences (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31801786/>), and highlighted some potential limitations (e.g. the weighting towards single author papers).