

Highlights

Measuring the continuous research impact of a researcher: The K_z index

Kiran Sharma,Ziya Uddin

- Traditional metrics such as total publications, citations count, and the h -index provide an overall measure of research impact but fail to capture the continuous contribution of researchers. Therefore, there is a need for a robust tool to measure the continuous research impact.
- The proposed K_z index is introduced as a solution, taking into account both the impact and age of publications.
- Even if two or more researchers have identical total publications, citations count, and h -index, it is unlikely that they share the same K_z scores This characteristic of the K_z index makes it a valuable ranking tool.
- The K_z index enables the identification of both star contributors and those with lower impact in the realm of research.
- By measuring the continuous research impact, a more comprehensive assessment can be achieved, leading to fair evaluations towards career progression support and research funding.

Measuring the continuous research impact of a researcher: The K_z index

Kiran Sharma^a, Ziya Uddin^a

^a*School of Engineering & Technology, BML Munjal University, Gurugram, Haryana-122413, India*

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

h-index

Research impact

Research evaluation

Citation analysis

Science policy

Scientometrics

ABSTRACT

The ongoing discussion regarding the utilization of individual research performance for academic hiring, funding allocation, and resource distribution has prompted the need for improved metrics. While traditional measures such as total publications, citations count, and the *h*-index provide a general overview of research impact, they fall short of capturing the continuous contribution of researchers over time. To address this limitation, we propose the implementation of the K_z index, which takes into account both publication impact and age. In this study, we calculated K_z scores for 376 research profiles. K_z reveals that the researchers with the same *h*-index can exhibit different K_z scores, and vice versa. Furthermore, we observed instances where researchers with lower citation counts obtained higher K_z scores, and vice versa. Interestingly, the K_z metric follows a log-normal distribution. It highlights its potential as a valuable tool for ranking researchers and facilitating informed decision-making processes. By measuring the continuous research impact, we enable fair evaluations, enhance decision-making processes, and provide focused career advancement support and funding opportunities.

1. Introduction

Research impact is a crucial factor when evaluating the contributions of researchers (Egghe, 2010). It plays a vital role in assessing the quality, significance, and reach of their work, which is instrumental in academic promotions, grant allocations, award selections, and overall career progression. Existing indices like the *h*-index and citation count are commonly used to measure research impact (Bornmann and Daniel, 2005, 2009); however, it's important to recognize that citations may not provide a comprehensive representation of impact, especially in fields where citation practices differ or in emerging research domains with limited citation opportunities. Therefore, a more nuanced approach is necessary to capture the full extent of the research impact, considering multiple dimensions beyond traditional metrics.

The *h*-index has been subject to criticism due to its limitations in providing a comprehensive view of scientific impact (Costas and Bordons, 2007). Initially introduced in 2005 by Hirsch, the *h*-index is calculated based on the number of papers that have received at least *h* citations from other papers (Hirsch, 2005). Since its introduction, the *h*-index has gained significant popularity in academia and has been commonly employed to evaluate the academic success of scientists in various areas, including hiring decisions, promotions, and grant acceptances. Despite efforts by researchers to propose alternative variants of the *h*-index (Egghe, 2006; Jin, Liang, Rousseau, and Egghe, 2007; Zhang, 2009; Alonso, Cabrerizo, Herrera-Viedma, and Herrera, 2010; Khurana and Sharma, 2022), the traditional *h*-index remains widely used as a performance metric in the assessment of scientists because of its simplicity.

To overcome the limitations of *h*-index, Egghe in 2006 proposed *g*-index which is determined by the distribution of citations across their publications. It is determined by sorting the articles in decreasing order based on the number of citations they have received. The *g*-index is defined as the largest number *g* for which the top *g* articles collectively accumulate at least g^2 citations (Egghe, 2006). This means that a researcher with a *g*-index of 10 has published at least 10 articles that collectively have received at least $(10^2 = 100)$ citations. It's important to note that unlike the *h*-index, the citations contributing to the *g*-index can be generated by only a small number of articles. For example, a researcher with 10 papers, where 5 papers have no citations and the remaining five have 350, 35, 10, 2, and 2 citations respectively, would have a *g*-index of 10 but an *h*-index of 3 (as only three papers have at least three citations each).

*Corresponding authors

✉ kiran.sharma@bmu.edu.in (K. Sharma); ziya.uddin@bmu.edu.in (Z. Uddin)

ORCID(s):

Further, after recognizing the limitations of the h -index (Ding, Liu, and Kandonga, 2020), researchers have proposed various complementary measures to provide a more comprehensive assessment of research impact such as R -index (Jin et al., 2007), e -index (Zhang, 2009), h' -index (Zhang, 2013). In the study by Khurana et al. (2022) (Khurana and Sharma, 2022), an enhancement to the h -index is proposed to capture the impact of the highly cited paper. They introduced h_c which is based on the weight assigned to the highly cited paper. h_c has a greater impact on researchers with lower h -index values, particularly by highlighting the significance of their highly cited paper. However, the effect of h_c on established researchers with higher h -index values was found to be negligible. It is worth noting that the h_c focuses on the first highly cited paper and does not consider the impact of subsequent highly cited papers. This limitation again highlights the need for a more comprehensive measure that takes into account all the important factors contributing to research impact (Martin, 1996).

The another measure named, L -sequence, introduced by Liu et al. (Liu and Yang, 2014), computes the h -index sequence for cumulative publications while taking into account the yearly citation performance. In this approach, the L number is calculated based on the h -index concept for a specific year. Consequently, the impact of the most highly cited paper in that year may be overlooked, and papers with less than L citations are also not considered. Although the concept captures the yearly citation performance of all papers, it does not effectively capture the continuous impact of each individual paper. Also gathering data for the L -sequence can be challenging, as it requires delving into the citation history of each paper for every year.

Quantifying research impact is a multifaceted endeavor (Batista, Campiteli, and Kinouchi, 2006). There is no universally accepted metric or methodology for measuring continuous research impact, and different stakeholders may prioritize different indicators, such as publications, citations, patents, or societal impact. Measuring the continuous research impact of a researcher is crucial for granular assessment, differentiation among researchers, funding decisions, identification of emerging talent, etc. Determining an inclusive and comprehensive approach that captures the diverse dimensions of research impact remains a challenge.

1.1. Research Objective

The primary objective of this study is to introduce a reliable metric that can effectively capture the continuous research impact of a researcher. The aim of the proposed metric is to differentiate between two researchers who possess identical research parameters. In order to accomplish the stated objective, a newly introduced measure called the K_z -index has been proposed.

2. K_z -index

The proposed K_z index serves as a tool to measure the research impact of a researcher. It aims to capture the continuous and evolving contributions made by the researcher over time, considering factors such as total publications, citation count, and publication age.

2.1. Definition of K_z -index

To measure the continuous research impact of a researcher, K_z takes into account two important factors of research:

1. **Impact (k):** The impact of a paper is determined by considering two factors: the number of citations (C) it has received and its h -index.

The impact of the paper is calculated by using the following equation;

$$C \leq (h + 1)^k, \quad (1)$$

where $k \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

2. **Age (Δt):** Δt represents the publication age in relation to the current year and can be determined through the following computation.

$$\Delta t = C_y - P_y \quad (2)$$

where C_y represents the current year and P_y represents the publication year.

Now, from Eq.1 and Eq.2, K_z can be calculated for every researcher i as

$$K_z = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{k_i}{\Delta t_i} \quad (3)$$

where N is number of publications and $N > 0$.

Equation 3 highlights the significance of K_z metric by incorporating essential research indicators, including total citations, year of publication, number of publications, publication age, and h -index. This comprehensive approach ensures that all significant aspects of a researcher's work are considered, resulting in a more robust and holistic assessment of their research impact.

2.2. Advantages of K_z

Measuring the continuous research impact of a researcher is crucial for several reasons:

1. *Granular assessment*: Traditional matrices such as the citations count, h -index, etc. present an overall impact on a researcher and do not have the capability to capture the ongoing progress and advancement of their work, whereas K_z can acquire a more nuanced and thorough comprehension of a researcher's contributions as they evolve over time.
2. *Differentiation among researchers*: Even if two researchers possess the same h -index, their patterns of impact over time may vary significantly. Analyzing their continuous research impact can uncover disparities in productivity and can provide a more comprehensive understanding of their individual profiles. Hence, K_z allows for a more nuanced differentiation among researchers.
3. *Evaluation of long-term impact*: Researchers may experience fluctuations in their productivity and impact over their careers. Measuring continuous research impact enables the evaluation of long-term contributions. K_z has the capability of highlighting researchers who consistently generate influential work and have a lasting impact on their field.
4. *Career progression and funding decisions*: Many academic institutions, funding agencies, and hiring committees rely on research performance metrics to make decisions. K_z can provide more informed evaluations of researchers, enabling fairer assessments and enhancing the recognition of sustained excellence.
5. *Identification of emerging talent*: Continuous research impact measurement can help identify early-career researchers with promising trajectories. By recognizing their continuous growth and impact, further opportunities can be provided to nurture their potential.

3. Case studies of K_z

We conducted four case studies to explore the significance of K_z . Each case study involved two researchers, namely $R1$ and $R2$. The number of publications was kept constant across all cases, while the focus was on comparing the h -index and total citations (TC) of two researchers.

1. **Case I - Identical h -index and total citations**: Table 1 represents the first case study where we assumed that both researchers $R1$ and $R2$ have the same h -index and total citations count. However, despite sharing these characteristics, researcher $R2$ obtained a higher K_z score than $R1$. This difference in K_z scores can be attributed to the impact of the publication year, which played a dominant role in determining the continuous research impact of each researcher. It highlights the significance of considering the temporal aspect of research contributions when assessing the research impact on individuals.
2. **Case II - Identical h -index and different total citations**: In this case (Table 2), both researchers $R1$ and $R2$ have an equal number of publications and h -index, but they differ in their total citations count. Researcher $R1$ has one highly cited paper, while researcher $R2$ has multiple highly cited papers. Despite $R1$ having a higher total number of citations compared to $R2$, $R2$ obtains a higher K_z score. This indicates that the impact of having multiple highly cited papers outweighs the effect of a single highly cited paper in determining the continuous research impact.

Table 1Two researchers with identical h -index and total citations.

Case I	Researcher 1, $h = 4$					Researcher 2, $h = 4$				
S. No	P_y	C	k	Δt	k'	P_y	C	k	Δt	k'
1	2014	40	2.2921	9	0.255	2014	2	0.4307	9	0.048
2	2015	30	2.1133	8	0.264	2015	3	0.6827	8	0.085
3	2016	0	0	7	0	2016	3	0.6827	7	0.098
4	2017	3	0.6827	6	0.114	2016	40	2.2921	7	0.327
5	2018	24	1.9747	5	0.395	2017	1	0	6	0
6	2019	1	0	4	0	2018	30	2.1133	5	0.423
7	2020	1	0	3	0	2019	22	1.9206	4	0.48
8	2021	1	0	2	0	2020	0	0	3	0
9	2022	0	0	1	0	2021	1	0	2	0
10	2022	10	1.4307	1	1.431	2022	8	1.2921	1	1.292
	$TC = 110, K_z = 2.459$					$TC = 110, K_z = 2.753$				

Table 2Two researchers with identical h -index and different total citations.

Case II	Researcher 1, $h = 4$					Researcher 2, $h = 4$				
S. No	P_y	C	k	Δt	k'	P_y	C	k	Δt	k'
1	2014	1000	4.2921	9	0.477	2014	500	3.8614	9	0.429
2	2015	4	0.8614	8	0.108	2015	300	3.544	8	0.443
3	2016	0	0	7	0	2016	100	2.8614	7	0.409
4	2017	4	0.8614	6	0.144	2016	0	0	7	0
5	2018	5	1.0001	5	0.2	2017	2	0.4307	6	0.072
6	2019	1	0	4	0	2018	50	2.4307	5	0.486
7	2020	1	0	3	0	2019	1	0	4	0
8	2021	1	0	2	0	2020	3	0.6827	3	0.228
9	2022	0	0	1	0	2021	1	0	2	0
10	2022	0	0	1	0	2022	0	0	1	0
	$TC = 1016, K_z = 0.929$					$TC = 957, K_z = 2.067$				

- Case III(a) - Different h -index and total citations:** In this case (Table 3), both researchers have an equal number of publications but differ in their h -index, number of high impact papers, and total citations. Researcher $R1$ has a higher h -index but lower total citation count compared to $R2$. However, despite $R1$ having a lower total citation count, they obtain the highest K_z score. This highlights the importance of considering the continuous research impact captured by K_z , which takes into account not only the number of citations but also the publication age and impact of publications.
- Case III(b) - Different h -index and Total Citations::** In this case (Table 4), we again considered two researchers with an equal number of publications but different h -index, high impact papers, and total citations. Researchers $R1$ had a higher h -index and total citation count compared to researcher $R2$. Surprisingly, despite these differences, it was researcher $R2$ who obtained the highest K_z score. This finding suggests that the K_z score takes into account factors beyond just h -index and total citations, emphasizing the importance of considering the continuous impact and temporal aspects of research contributions.

4. Empirical study

To calculate the continuous research impact (K_z) of researchers, the research profiles of 376 individuals affiliated with Monash University, Australia were obtained. Monash University is a public research institution located in Australia, and information about the researchers can be found on their webpage at <https://research.monash.edu/en/persons/>. The webpage provides the researcher's research ID and Orcid ID, which facilitated the extraction of their publication details and citations from the Web of Science database. From a pool of 6316 researchers' profiles,

Table 3

Two researchers with different h -index and total citations where R1 has higher h -index and lower total citations than R2.

Case III	Researcher 1, $h = 5$					Researcher 2, $h = 3$				
S. No	P_y	C	k	Δt	k'	P_y	C	k	Δt	k'
1	2014	90	2.5114	9	0.279	2014	250	3.9829	9	0.443
2	2015	80	2.4457	8	0.306	2015	2	0.5001	8	0.063
3	2016	20	1.672	7	0.239	2016	2	0.5001	7	0.071
4	2017	3	0.6132	6	0.102	2016	82	3.1788	7	0.454
5	2018	24	1.7738	5	0.355	2017	2	0.5001	6	0.083
6	2019	2	0.3869	4	0.097	2018	110	3.3907	5	0.678
7	2020	3	0.6132	3	0.204	2019	1	0	4	0
8	2021	3	0.6132	2	0.307	2020	2	0.5001	3	0.167
9	2022	2	0.3869	1	0.387	2021	2	0.5001	2	0.25
10	2022	23	1.75	1	1.75	2022	0	0	1	0
	$TC = 250, K_z = 4.026$					$TC = 453, K_z = 2.209$				

Table 4

Two researchers with different h -index and total citations where R1 has higher h -index and total citations than R2.

Case IV	Researcher 1, $h = 6$					Researcher 2, $h = 4$				
S. No	P_y	C	k	Δt	k'	P_y	C	k	Δt	k'
1	2014	200	2.7228	9	0.303	2014	2	0.4307	9	0.048
2	2015	150	2.575	8	0.322	2015	2	0.4307	8	0.054
3	2016	5	0.8271	7	0.118	2016	3	0.6827	7	0.098
4	2017	10	1.1833	6	0.197	2016	1	0	7	0
5	2018	35	1.8271	5	0.365	2017	280	3.5011	6	0.584
6	2019	1	0	4	0	2018	2	0.4307	5	0.086
7	2020	33	1.7969	3	0.599	2019	40	2.2921	4	0.573
8	2021	1	0	2	0	2020	70	2.6398	3	0.88
9	2022	2	0.3563	1	0.356	2021	2	0.4307	2	0.215
10	2022	32	1.7811	1	1.781	2022	50	2.4307	1	2.431
	$TC = 469, K_z = 4.041$					$TC = 452, K_z = 4.969$				

we selected 376 profiles across different disciplines, ensuring a range of h -index values ($1 \leq h \leq 112$). The choice of databases was made based on data availability. For each researcher ID, information regarding the publication year and the corresponding citations received were extracted. For each researcher, the h -index, g -index, and K_z were computed. Additionally, the overall research age or career length of the researcher was determined by subtracting the year of his/her first publication from the current year.

4.1. Comparison of K_z with h -index and career length

By using equation 3, we calculated the K_z score of 376 researchers. In Figure 1, a scatter plot depicting the relationship between K_z and career length. Each dot on the plot represents an individual researcher. The horizontal dashed line represents the median of the axis, while vertical dashed lines are used to divide the plot into three zones based on the length of the researchers' careers: early career (≤ 10 years), mid career (> 10 and ≤ 20 years) and advanced career (> 20 years). This visualization clearly differentiate between the star performer and average performer at different career stages.

Table 5 provides examples of researchers who have the same h -index values of 25 and 30. It also includes the computation of the g -index, which demonstrates that researchers with the same h -index can have different g values due to variations in their total citation counts. Therefore, it is possible for a researcher with a lower citation count to have a higher g -index, and vice versa. The presence of the same h -index highlights its limitation in differentiating the top-performing researcher from others whereas K_z significantly differentiates the impactful researcher from others. This distinction highlights the varying impact among researchers. Similarly, Table 6 showcases profiles of researchers with the same career age, yet their K_z scores differ. K_z clearly differentiates the impactful researcher from others where researchers are of the same career length. The same observation applies to total publication and citation counts.




Figure 1: Scattered plot of K_z versus career length. Each dot correspond to a researcher. The horizontal dashed line represents the median of the axis and vertical dashed lines divides the plots in three zones based on the researcher's career length.

Table 5
Comparative analysis among researchers having identical h -index.

WoS Researcher ID	Career Length (yrs)	Publications	Total Citations	h -index	g -index	K_z
B-6419-2008	17	44	2415	25	44	5.24
H-6054-2014	19	38	3433	25	37	6.76
D-5776-2019	26	68	1984	25	45	6.828
J-1532-2014	18	59	2982	25	46	7.896
N-8153-2014	20	78	4217	25	65	9.156
E-6623-2015	14	59	1530	25	38	10.618
A-3854-2010	21	86	2034	25	44	11.224
K-5277-2012	24	73	3783	25	64	11.912
B-8486-2008	29	79	2851	30	54	4.487
G-1412-2012	34	69	2816	30	56	5.517
H-3196-2013	13	94	2538	30	49	8.684
F-2273-2010	16	102	2627	30	48	10.446
I-1956-2014	23	123	3797	30	60	11.05
I-1738-2013	19	105	3306	30	57	11.309
D-4239-2011	25	133	3343	30	59	12.475
H-4935-2013	15	100	2945	30	52	18.97

In Table 7, we examined 11 comparative cases of researchers with identical h -index and career length. Among these cases, one noteworthy instance is $S1$, where two researchers share the same career length of 8 years and h -index of 12. However, the researcher with higher total publications and citations count has a higher K_z score than the other. Whereas, in case $S3$, two researchers have a career length of 13 years and h -index of 19, the one with lower total publications but higher citation counts, compared to the other researcher, has a higher K_z score. On the other hand, in case $S7$, two researchers have a career length of 17 years and h -index of 13, the one with higher total publications but lower citation counts, compared to the other researcher, has a higher K_z score. Hence, this indicates that the K_z metric considers all relevant research indicators such as total publications, citation count, h -index, and publication age to capture the continuous impact of an individual. It is not safe to assume that a higher K_z score is solely determined by either higher total publications or higher citation counts. Additionally, it cannot be concluded that a person with a higher h -index will always have a higher K_z score. The K_z metric takes a comprehensive approach in evaluating research impact, considering multiple factors simultaneously.

Table 6

Comparative analysis among researchers having identical career length.

WoS Researcher ID	Career Length (yrs)	Publications	Total Citations	<i>h</i> -index	<i>g</i> -index	K_z
K-5514-2018	10	9	32	4	6	1.043
P-7354-2019	10	8	171	6	8	1.69
I-9365-2017	10	20	287	10	17	3.823
G-3877-2013	10	75	1189	18	34	9.813
L-4481-2018	10	90	6012	28	83	22.385
N-4364-2019	20	23	757	14	23	1.905
A-4190-2009	20	32	832	14	29	3.795
B-7556-2008	20	60	7144	27	54	6.847
C-9764-2013	20	122	5917	42	77	10.995
I-1587-2014	20	107	1127	18	30	12.88
C-4319-2011	20	170	5080	39	62	19.088
H-9193-2014	30	26	181	8	14	2.939
P-8366-2016	30	98	5701	40	77	6.378
B-9553-2008	30	91	6784	45	85	10.524
H-5706-2014	30	171	4559	35	60	15.996
A-5452-2008	30	283	26495	89	158	25.657
I-6251-2012	30	280	58171	68	244	29.05

4.2. Probability distribution of K_z

Figure 2 presents a graphical representation of the plot for $\log(K_z)$, which exhibits a mean value of μ and a standard deviation of σ . This plot is compared to the normal distribution with the same mean and standard deviation. The overlapping nature of the two plots suggests that the variable K_z follows a log-normal distribution. To confirm this observation, a ‘‘Goodness of Fit’’ test was conducted using the χ^2 distribution. The objective of the Goodness of Fit Test was to assess the suitability of the null hypothesis that states ‘‘the distribution of $\log(K_z)$ conforms well to a normal distribution.’’ The test was executed in the following manner:

The logarithm of the values of K_z was computed, and these values were then classified into seven distinct classes, taking into account the mean ($\mu = 0.78787$) and standard deviation ($\sigma = 0.37448$). Subsequently, the observed frequencies (O_i) for each class were determined. To obtain the expected frequencies (E_i), the entire dataset consisting of 376 observations was subjected to calculations based on the normal distribution. The specific calculations and their results are provided in Table 8.

The χ^2 value was computed using the formula $\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}$ and yielded a value of 7.466. As the calculated χ^2 value is smaller than the critical value $\chi_{(6,0.05)}^2 = 12.592$, we cannot reject the null hypothesis at a significance level of 0.05. Therefore, we can conclude that $\log(K_z)$ is a suitable fit for the normal distribution.

4.2.1. Identification of top contributors and low contributors

In the case of a normal distribution, the middle 50% of the data is encompassed within a range of $+0.67$ and -0.67 standard scores from the mean. Consequently, researchers in the top 25% satisfy the condition $K_z \geq e^{(\mu+0.67\sigma)}$, while researchers in the bottom 25% satisfy the condition $K_z \leq e^{(\mu-0.67\sigma)}$. Similarly, using the properties of normal distribution, the $\alpha\%$ of top and bottom performers can be identified. Unlike previous indices such as the h , g , e , h_c , etc., the K_z -index allows for the identification of both top and bottom contributors. This categorization based on K_z scores can be beneficial for universities, scientific communities, and research funding agencies in identifying significant contributors.

5. Discussion and conclusion

In this study, we have discussed various research indicators, including total publications, citations count, h -index, g -index, etc., commonly used to measure the impact of research. While total publications, citation count, and h -index are commonly used indicators to assess research impact, they have some limitations when considered individually.

Table 7

Comparative analysis among researchers having identical research career length (yrs) and h -index.

S.No	WoS Researcher ID	Career Length (yrs)	Publications	Total Citations	h -index	g -index	K_z
S1	F-9424-2013	8	37	1595	12	5	7.041
	O-7942-2018	8	34	454	12	7	5.291
S2	AAE-7279-2019	12	47	1529	15	18	11.122
	I-9929-2012	12	37	1236	15	26	4.321
S3	L-4989-2018	13	84	1875	19	16	20.182
	M-7607-2014	13	106	1130	19	29	8.26
S4	E-6431-2011	14	16	508	8	16	4.057
	N-1676-2017	14	14	726	8	22	2.771
S5	A-7222-2013	14	28	608	14	21	6.299
	L-1320-2019	14	23	875	14	21	3.264
S6	K-7419-2014	15	52	482	11	16	2.845
	G-1470-2011	15	36	351	11	13	4.741
S7	O-9174-2014	17	36	708	13	22	4.444
	J-5651-2016	17	16	857	13	22	2.173
S8	Q-9068-2018	18	47	2034	21	36	7.279
	H-4554-2014	18	53	1462	21	26	8.99
S9	F-6776-2014	18	159	1843	23	28	15.62
	H-8387-2012	18	78	1798	23	34	8.635
S10	F-4112-2014	22	18	617	13	38	2.402
	C-6296-2014	22	35	1456	13	38	4.842
S11	C-2440-2013	28	38	6087	27	60	2.401
	N-5018-2017	28	87	2588	27	62	7.02




Figure 2: Distribution of $\log(K_z)$ (dashed red) versus normal distribution (solid black) with same μ and σ .

Table 8
Goodness of fit test.

Classes	Observed Frequencies (O_i)	Expected frequencies (E_i) for $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma)$
$\log(K_z) < \mu - 1.5\sigma$	14	25
$\mu - 1.5\sigma \leq \log(K_z) < \mu - \sigma$	34	35
$\mu - \sigma \leq \log(K_z) < \mu - 0.5\sigma$	57	56
$\mu - 0.5\sigma \leq \log(K_z) < \mu + 0.5\sigma$	157	144
$\mu + 0.5\sigma \leq \log(K_z) < \mu + \sigma$	57	56
$\mu + \sigma \leq \log(K_z) < \mu + 1.5\sigma$	29	35
$\log(K_z) \geq \mu + 1.5\sigma$	28	25
Total	376	

1. *Total publications*: Relying solely on the number of publications can be misleading, as it does not consider the quality or impact of those publications. Quantity alone does not reflect the significance or influence of a researcher's work.
2. *Citations count*: While citation count is a useful indicator of the influence and visibility of a researcher's work, it can be influenced by factors such as the field of study, publication age, and citation practices within the research community. Additionally, self-citations can artificially inflate citation counts and impact assessments.
3. *h-index*: The *h-index* takes into account both the number of publications and their corresponding citations. However, it does not differentiate between highly cited publications and those with fewer citations. A researcher with a few highly influential papers can have the same *h-index* as someone with many moderately cited papers. Additionally *h-index* ignores all the papers which are cited less than the *h*.
4. *Temporal considerations*: Individual metrics may not capture the continuous progress and development of a researcher's work over time. They provide a snapshot of impact at a specific moment and may not reflect the long-term contributions or evolving research trajectory.

To overcome these limitations and capture the dynamic nature of research impact, it is essential to consider multiple indicators and employ comprehensive assessment approaches like the K_z metric, which incorporates various factors to provide a more nuanced understanding of research impact. K_z is filed independent as well as takes into account the temporal aspect of the work. Unlike other research indicators, K_z takes into account not only the total publications and citations count but the age of the publications too. Our results demonstrate how K_z can effectively differentiate between two potential researchers who may have the same *h-index*, citations count, or career length. By incorporating K_z into the evaluation process, we can better assess the research dynamics of an individual and gain insights into their continuous impact over time.

To conclude, K_z holds the potential to serve as a superior measure for capturing the impact of individuals, institutions, or journals. Its comprehensive consideration of various research indicators allows a more nuanced assessment of research impact. Further K_z can be utilized as a ranking method to evaluate and rank researchers within an institution based on their research impact. Similarly, institutions and journals can be compared and ranked according to their research impact. This information can be valuable in decision-making processes, as funding agencies, research award committees and hiring bodies can leverage the power of K_z to rank potential candidates within a specific field. It provides a standardized tool to assess and compare the impact of research entities, facilitating more informed decisions and promoting recognition based on research excellence.

There are some challenges associated with computing the K_z metric too. Some of the potential challenges include:

1. *Data availability and accuracy*: Obtaining accurate and comprehensive data from various sources can be a challenge. Different databases may have variations in the coverage of publications and citations, potentially leading to incomplete or inconsistent data.
2. *Data quality and reliability*: The accuracy and reliability of the data sources used for computing K_z are crucial as inaccurate or incomplete data can result in misleading or flawed assessments of research impact.

3. *Self-citation manipulation*: The issue of self-citation manipulation, where researchers excessively cite their own work to inflate their impact metrics, can pose a challenge as detecting such manipulations requires careful scrutiny and data filtering techniques.

As discussed, it can be inferred that the K_z index is a comprehensive mathematical function that considers multiple factors to assess the impact of a researcher. These factors include the researcher's total publications, the citation count of each paper, the researcher's h -index, and the age of publication. The K_z index recognizes influential papers which often receive citations at a faster rate, indicating a greater impact, and therefore assigns them higher weight in impact evaluation. By considering these aspects, the K_z index tends to yield higher values in cases where a researcher has made significant contributions that have garnered substantial citations.

Acknowledgement

We acknowledge the suggestions provided by Dr. Satyam Mukherjee.

References

- L. Egghe, The hirsch index and related impact measures, *Annual review of information science and technology* 44 (2010) 65–114.
- L. Bornmann, H.-D. Daniel, Does the h-index for ranking of scientists really work?, *Scientometrics* 65 (2005) 391–392.
- L. Bornmann, H.-D. Daniel, The state of h index research: is the h index the ideal way to measure research performance?, *EMBO reports* 10 (2009) 2–6.
- R. Costas, M. Bordons, The h-index: Advantages, limitations and its relation with other bibliometric indicators at the micro level, *Journal of informetrics* 1 (2007) 193–203.
- J. E. Hirsch, An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output, *Proceedings of the National academy of Sciences* 102 (2005) 16569–16572.
- L. Egghe, Theory and practise of the g-index, *Scientometrics* 69 (2006) 131–152.
- B. Jin, L. Liang, R. Rousseau, L. Egghe, The r-and ar-indices: Complementing the h-index, *Chinese science bulletin* 52 (2007) 855–863.
- C.-T. Zhang, The e-index, complementing the h-index for excess citations, *PLoS One* 4 (2009) e5429.
- S. Alonso, F. J. Cabrerizo, E. Herrera-Viedma, F. Herrera, hg-index: A new index to characterize the scientific output of researchers based on the h-and g-indices, *Scientometrics* 82 (2010) 391–400.
- P. Khurana, K. Sharma, Impact of h-index on author's rankings: an improvement to the h-index for lower-ranked authors, *Scientometrics* 127 (2022) 4483–4498.
- Y. Liu, Y. Yang, Empirical study of l-sequence: The basic h-index sequence for cumulative publications with consideration of the yearly citation performance, *Journal of Informetrics* 8 (2014) 478–485.
- J. Ding, C. Liu, G. A. Kandonga, Exploring the limitations of the h-index and h-type indexes in measuring the research performance of authors, *Scientometrics* 122 (2020) 1303–1322.
- C.-T. Zhang, The h'-index, effectively improving the h-index based on the citation distribution, *PloS one* 8 (2013) e59912.
- B. Martin, The use of multiple indicators in the assessment of basic research, *Scientometrics* 36 (1996) 343–362.
- P. D. Batista, M. G. Campiteli, O. Kinouchi, Is it possible to compare researchers with different scientific interests?, *Scientometrics* 68 (2006) 179–189.