

Estimating achievement from fame¹

M.V. Simkin and V.P. Roychowdhury

NetSeer Inc. - 11943 Montana Ave. Suite 200, Los Angeles, CA 90049 and Department of Electrical Engineering, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1594

We report a method for estimating people's achievement based on their fame. Earlier we discovered that fame of fighter pilot aces (measured as number of Google hits) grows exponentially with their achievement (number of victories). We hypothesize that the same functional relation between achievement and fame holds for other professions. This allows us to estimate achievement for professions where an unquestionable and universally accepted measure of achievement does not exist. We apply the method to Nobel Prize winners in Physics. For example, we obtain that Paul Dirac, who is hundred times less famous than Einstein contributed to physics only two times less. We compare our results with Landau's ranking.

Earlier we discovered [1] that fame of WWI fighter pilot aces (measured in Google hits) grows exponentially with their achievement (measured in victories). Since then Bagrow *et al* found [2], that for physicists the relation between achievement and fame is linear. The measure of achievement used in that study was the number of published papers. However, Bogdanoff affair [3] demonstrated that one could publish in respectable journals even papers consisting of an incoherent stream of buzzwords of modern physics. Thus, we cannot use the number of published papers to measure scientific achievement. Garfield suggested [4] that the number of citations to scientist's papers is the true measure of scientific achievement. In another study [5], [6] we had shown that since citations multiply by mere copying this measure is also questionable. While the number of citations may be increasing with the size of scientific contribution made in the paper, it is not obvious what the exact relation between these variables is. In this paper, we hypothesize that the same exponential relation between fame and achievement, as we found for fighter pilots, holds for people of other professions. We then use their fame (measured in Google hits) to infer their achievement².

In Ref.[1] we found that fame, F , depends on achievement, A , according to the following equation:

$$F(A) = C \times \exp(\beta \times A) \quad (1)$$

Here β and C are parameters determined by regression. To be precise, the real data of fame as a function of achievement present not a smooth curve, but a scatter plot (see Fig 1 of [1]). Nonetheless, given the value of achievement, we can greatly reduce the uncertainty in the value of fame. Similarly, given the value of fame, we can try to estimate achievement. This we can do by simple inversion of Eq. (1):

$$A(F) = \ln(F/C)/\beta \quad (2)$$

We will first see how it works using the aces data where we do know both fame and achievement. We computed for every ace an estimate of achievement based on his fame using Eq.(2). We then

¹ A modified version of this article under the title "Von Richthofen, Einstein and the AGA" was published in March 2011 issue of Significance <http://www.significancemagazine.org/details/magazine/1036513/Von-Richthofen-Einstein-and-the-AGA-html>

² We do not insist that web hit counts are preferable to citation counts. These two measures of fame are strongly correlated and are interchangeable. We used web hits because we used them for fighter pilots aces in our earlier study. The point of this paper is not that one should use web hits, but that one should take a logarithm of fame to estimate achievement.

divided it by his real achievement. Figure 1 shows the distribution of such ratios of estimated and real achievements for 392 German WWI aces studied in Ref [1]. With high accuracy, we can approximate it by a lognormal distribution with mean zero and variance of 0.49. Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is passed with the p-value of 0.40. Analysis of the data of Fig.1 shows that with 50% probability estimated achievement is between 0.7 and 1.44 of real achievement. With 95% probability, estimated achievement is between 0.43 and 2.4 of real achievement. And with the 85% probability the real achievement is between two times more and two times less than the estimate. The estimate is thus not very accurate; however, even such crude an estimate can provide some insight in the fields where we have no clue of how to measure achievement.




Figure 1. Cumulative distribution of the ratio of predicted achievement to actual achievement.

Let us now try to estimate physicist's achievement based on their fame. Table 1 shows the names of 45 pre-WWII Nobel Laureates in Physics³, ranked according to their fame. Figure 2 shows their fame distribution. It is very similar to the fame distribution of aces (see Fig. 4 of Ref. [1]). We hypothesize that the relation between achievement and fame for physicists is, similar to aces, given by Eq. (2). A big difference with the case of aces is that we do not know the values of β and C . For the case of aces, where we knew achievement values, we determined these coefficients by regression. For physicists since we do not know the achievement (we actually are to determine it) the coefficients are unknown. The fact that β is unknown is irrelevant, as it cancels out from the ratio of achievements.

³ The list includes all of the pre-WWII Nobel Laureates in Physics, excluding Charles Wilson who had so many namesakes that his fame was impossible to determine.




Figure 2. Distribution of fame of Nobel Prize winning physicists. The solid line is a power-law fit with exponent 1.5. This distribution is very similar to the fame distribution of flying aces given in Ref.[1]

The most famous physicist in Table 1 is Albert Einstein, according to Eq.(2), he is, most likely, the most achieved. Therefore, we will use him as a unit of achievement, which we denote as A_E . From Eq.(2) we then get:

$$\frac{A}{A_E} = \frac{\ln(F/C)}{\ln(F_E/C)} \quad (3)$$

We still need to know C to find the achievement in Einsteins. While exact determination of C is impossible, we can find an upper bound on it. It is the fame of the least famous person in the list: C cannot be more than that because in that case the achievement of the least famous person will become negative. The least famous person on our list is Nils Dalén. His Nobel Prize is also the most contested: many believe his achievement is not worthy of it. Dalén received Nobel Prize for his invention of the automatic sun valve, which regulates a gaslight source by the action of sunlight, turning it off at dawn and on at dusk. Dalén also invented the pilot for a gas heater, which many of the contestants use in their houses. At the same time, most of the things invented by other people from our list have no practical applications, and those, which have applications, are very dangerous. Nevertheless, we will side with the contestants and assign Dalén the achievement of 0. Then we can substitute Dalén's fame, F_D , for C :

$$\frac{A}{A_E} \approx \frac{\ln(F/F_D)}{\ln(F_E/F_D)} \quad (4)$$

Eq.(4) is an estimate of a lower bound on the achievement in Einsteins. This is because $C \leq F_D$ and when $C < F_D$ Eq.(3) will give a higher value for $\frac{A}{A_E}$ than Eq.(4) for everyone but Einstein.

The estimates of achievement, computed using Eq.(4) are given in Table 1. We should note that the data presented in the table is very noisy since some physicists got additional fame for reasons other than their scientific achievement, for example for their role in public life. However, similar things happened to fighter-pilot aces that we studied in Ref.1. For example, Hermann Göring got additional web hits for his political activity. He is the second famous German WWI ace, though with his 22 victories he is only on about 60th place according to his achievement. The data shown in Fig.1 include all such cases. Let us emphasize that the error boundaries of the estimate of achievement from fame are based on the data that include all the noise and the extra hits received by aces for activities other than their career as a fighter pilot. Another objection that we encountered is that Max Planck got a lot of fame due to the singular event: renaming of Keiser Wilhelm Society into Max Planck Society. All the institutes under auspices of the society became Max Planck institutes. Every scientific paper published by the members of Max Planck institutes automatically mentions Max Planck in its address line. Similarly, when a news article or a blog entry discusses a discovery by a member of one of the institutes, it mentions scientist's affiliation and therefore Max Planck. Together they contribute a large share of web hits. A Google search for "Max Planck Institute" OR "Max Plank Institut" produces 6,500,000 hits. If we subtract this number from the total number of hits, we are left with 4,100,000. This shifts Max Planck from the second place to the third. The estimate of his achievement in Einsteins drops from 0.91 to 0.8 or by 12%. The effect is thus not very big.

The estimate of achievement of every physicist listed in Table 1 (with the only exception of Dalen) is at least 15% of Einstein's achievement. For example, Dirac and Schrödinger who are 90 and 60 times less famous than Einstein appear to achieve only two times less. This may seem shocking to some people. Are these results meaningful?

Half a century ago a Nobel Prize winning physicist Lev Landau classified theoretical physicists according to their achievement using a logarithmic scale [7]. According to his ranking system, a member of the lower class achieved ten times less than a member of the preceding class. He placed Einstein in $\frac{1}{2}$ class. In the 1st class he placed Bohr, Schrödinger, Heisenberg, Dirac, and Fermi⁴. Thus, he thought that Einstein contributed to Physics $\sqrt{10} \approx 3$ times more than Dirac or Schrödinger. This is close enough to our estimate, according to which Einstein achieved 2 times more than Dirac or Schrödinger. Taking into account our errors of two times more or two times less, this agreement is perfect. Note that Landau's ranking is incomparably closer to our estimate than to a naïve estimate equating fame and achievement. The agreement becomes worse in the cases of Heisenberg and Bohr where we estimate that they achieved 0.6 and 0.7 Einsteins correspondingly. However, earlier in his life, during 1930s, Landau used another classification [7]. According to it Lorentz, Planck, Einstein, Bohr, Heisenberg, Schrödinger, Dirac all belonged to the 1st class. Our results are compatible with this earlier Landau's classification.

A lot of recent attention was given to studies [8], where statistical analysis of very many non-expert opinions lead to estimates agreeing with reality as good or better than expert opinions. Every webpage about a particular person expresses its creator's opinion that the person in question is worthy of it. Thus, the fact that our estimate of achievement of Nobel Prize winning physicist based on statistical analysis of numbers of webpages mentioning them agrees fairly well with expert's (Landau's) opinion may be another demonstration of wisdom of crowds⁵.

⁴ These are the only people from Table 1, whose Landau rankings were given in [7].

⁵ Surowiecki argues [8] that one has to take an average of the guesses of a large number of people to arrive at a good estimation. In our case, many people make judgments whether to mention a particular person in their webpage. The parameter which corresponds to the average in Surowiecki's book is the fraction of cases when this judgment is positive. In Ref. [1] we introduced a model where the number of people considering mentioning a particular person in their webpages is proportional to the current number of webpages mentioning the person in question. The probability that their judgment will be positive is proportional to the person's achievement. The model produced an

- 1) Simkin, M.V. & Roychowdhury, V.P. Theory of Aces: Fame by chance or merit? Journal of Mathematical Sociology, **30** , 33–42 (2006). The e-print of this paper, published in 2003, is available here: <http://arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0310049>
- 2) J. P. Bagrow, H. D. Rozenfeld, E. M. Bollt, D. ben-Avraham, “How Famous is a Scientist? -- Famous to Those Who Know Us” Europhys. Lett. **67**, 511-516 (2004). Also available here: <http://arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0404515>
- 3) J. Baez, “The Bogdanoff Affair”, <http://math.ucr.edu/home/baez/bogdanoff/>
- 4) E. Garfield, “Citation Indexing” (John Wiley, New York, 1979).
- 5) Simkin, M.V. & Roychowdhury, V.P. Stochastic modeling of citation slips. Scientometrics, 62, 367-384 (2005); <http://arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0401529>
- 6) M.V. Simkin and V.P. Roychowdhury, “ A mathematical theory of citing”, Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 58(11):1661--1673, (2007); <http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0504094>
- 7) A. Livanova, *Landau* (Znanie, Moskva , 1983); in Russian. Available online here: <http://sgtnd.narod.ru/wts/rus/Landau.htm> ; There is an English translation (A. Livanova, *Landau, a great physicist and teacher* (Pergamon, Oxford, 1980)) of the previous edition of the book, but this does not mention the first classification used by Landau in 1930s.
- 8) J. Surowiecki “The wisdom of crowds” (Doubleday, New York, 2004)

exponential growth of fame (or number of webpages) with achievement (or fraction of positive judgments). To obtain the fraction of positive judgments one has to take a logarithm of fame as the number of considerations scales exponentially with fame.

Table 1

Physicist	Alternative names used in Google search, all joined using OR	June 2008 Google hits	Log over Dalen	Lower bound on the most likely achievement in Einsteins
ALBERT EINSTEIN		22,700,000	8.53	1
MAX PLANCK	MAX KARL ERNST LUDWIG PLANCK	10,600,000	7.77	0.911
MARIE CURIE		6,300,000	7.25	0.850
NIELS BOHR		1,890,000	6.04	0.709
ENRICO FERMI		1,730,000	5.95	0.698
GUGLIELMO MARCONI		1,110,000	5.51	0.646
WERNER HEISENBERG		987,000	5.39	0.632
ERWIN SCHRÖDINGER	ERWIN SCHRÖDINGER	375,000	4.43	0.519
PIERRE CURIE		330,000	4.30	0.504
WILHELM RÖNTGEN	WILHELM CONRAD RÖNTGEN WILHELM CONRAD ROENTGEN WILHELM ROENTGEN	272,000	4.10	0.481
PAUL DIRAC	PAUL ADRIEN MAURICE DIRAC PAUL AM DIRAC	255,000	4.04	0.474
LOUIS DE BROGLIE	LOUIS-VICTOR DE BROGLIE	201,000	3.80	0.446
LORD RAYLEIGH	LORD JOHN WILLIAM STRUTT RAYLEIGH	167,000	3.62	0.424
MAX VON LAUE		142,000	3.45	0.405
HENDRIK LORENTZ	HENDRIK ANTOON LORENTZ	119,000	3.28	0.384
ROBERT MILLIKAN	ROBERT ANDREWS MILLIKAN	112,000	3.22	0.377
JAMES FRANCK		109,000	3.19	0.374
JAMES CHADWICK		99,100	3.09	0.363
CHARLES GUILLAUME	CHARLES EDOUARD GUILLAUME	89,900	3.00	0.351
ERNEST ORLANDO LAWRENCE		89,500	2.99	0.351
ALBERT MICHELSON	ALBERT ABRAHAM MICHELSON	76,600	2.84	0.333
WILLIAM LAWRENCE BRAGG		74,500	2.81	0.329
JOSEPH JOHN THOMSON		73,700	2.80	0.328
ANTOINE BECQUEREL	ANTOINE HENRI BECQUEREL	70,300	2.75	0.323
ARTHUR COMPTON	ARTHUR HOLLY COMPTON	66,800	2.70	0.317
WILHELM WIEN		52,600	2.46	0.289
GABRIEL LIPPMANN		49,300	2.40	0.281
JOHANNES VAN DER WAALS	JOHANNES DIDERIK VAN DER WAALS	48,800	2.39	0.280
PIETER ZEEMAN		47,200	2.35	0.276
WILLIAM HENRY BRAGG		46,800	2.34	0.275
JOHANNES STARK		45,900	2.32	0.273
MANNE SIEGBAHN	KARL MANNE GEORG SIEGBAHN	45,000	2.30	0.270
PHILIPP LENARD	PHILIPP EDUARD ANTON LENARD	40,000	2.19	0.256
CARL FERDINAND BRAUN	KARL FERDINAND BRAUN	40,000	2.19	0.256
GUSTAV HERTZ		37,800	2.13	0.250
HEIKE KAMERLINGH-ONNES		35,100	2.06	0.241
SIR GEORGE THOMSON	GEORGE PAGET THOMSON	29,900	1.90	0.222
CLINTON DAVISSON	CLINTON JOSEPH DAVISSON	29,100	1.87	0.219
JEAN BAPTISTE PERRIN		28,600	1.85	0.217
CARL DAVID ANDERSON		26,400	1.77	0.208
OWEN RICHARDSON	WILLANS RICHARDSON	24,900	1.71	0.201
CHARLES BARKLA	CHARLES GLOVER BARKLA	24,500	1.70	0.199
CHANDRASEKHARA RAMAN	CHANDRASEKHARA VENKATA RAMAN	22,100	1.59	0.187
VICTOR FRANZ HESS		17,200	1.34	0.157
NILS DALÉN	NILS GUSTAF DALÉN NILS GUSTAF DALEN	4,490	0.00	0