

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

George Kaptay

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I think this is a valuable paper. However, it should be improved before it can be published.

- i. "For example, a researcher with H-index =20 means he/she published 20 articles having at least 20 citations". Please add „each”.
- ii. Define “self-citations”
- iii. define z as citations minus self-citations.
- iv. You do not propose anything specific, you rather propose a framework with many possible choices. How in this way you want to convince others to apply your method? The first step is that at least you must decide exactly what is your suggested method.
- v. You list only 9 citations. The literature of this question is much more rich than that. Read and add at least the following papers (plus consider references thereof):
 - Price DdS. Multiple Authorship. *Science*. 1981; 212(4498):986–986.
 - Schreiber, M. (2008a). To share the fame in a fair way, h_m modifies h for multi-authored manuscripts. *New J. Phys.*, **10**, 040201-1-8.
 - EGGHE, Leo (2008) Mathematical theory of the h- and g-index in case of fractional counting of authorship. In: JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR INFORMATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, 59(10). p. 1608-1616.
 - Wan JK, Hua PH, Rousseau R. The pure h-index: calculating an author's h-index by taking co-authors into account. *COLLNET Journal of Scientometrics and Information Management*. 2007; 1(2):1–5.
 - G.Kaptay. The k-index is introduced to replace the h-index to evaluate better the scientific excellence of individuals. *Heliyon* 6 (2020) e04415.