

Statistics for Ranking Program Committees and Editorial Boards

Roberto da Silva, José Palazzo de Oliveira, José Valdeni de Lima, Viviane Moreira Orengo

¹ Av. Bento Gonçalves, 9500. Bloco IV. CEP 91501-970, Porto Alegre, Brazil

Instituto de Informática – UFRGS

{rdasilva, palazzo, valdeni, mariusa, khannel, rmdenardi, vmorengo}@inf.ufrgs.br

Abstract. Ranking groups of researchers is important in several contexts and can serve many purposes such as the fair distribution of grants based on the scientist's publication output, concession of research projects, classification of journal editorial boards and many other applications in a social context. In this paper, we propose a method for measuring the performance of groups of researchers. The proposed method is called *α -index* and it is based on two parameters: (i) the homogeneity of the *h -indexes* of the researchers in the group; and (ii) the *h -group*, which is an extension of the *h -index* for groups. Our method integrates the concepts of homogeneity and absolute value of the *h -index* into a single measure which is appropriate for the evaluation of groups. We report on experiments that assess computer science conferences based on the *h -indexes* of their program committee members. Our results are similar to a manual classification scheme adopted by a research agency.

Keywords: Gini coefficient, *h -index*, Metrics in Science, Bibliometrics.

1 Introduction

The ranking and classification of researchers is among the most discussed topics in the academic community in the last decades [8-10]. Such a ranking is useful for the fair distribution of grants to researchers according to their excellence. Rankings can also be used to classify journals by the quality of their editorial boards. It is important to point out that in the scope of this paper, the term *quality* refers to the research output as measured by scientific publications. Numerical data on the distribution of citations has been extremely explored by the scientific community and universal results were established. Based on the ISI (Institute for Scientific Information) database, Laherrere et al. [9] suggest that the number of papers with x citations decay as a stretched exponential form $N(x) \sim \exp[-(x/x_0)^\beta]$ with $\beta \sim 0.3$ when analyzing data

from the 1120 most-cited physicists between 1981 and 1997. However, Redner [10] has shown that a stretched exponential fits fairly well numerical data for $x < 200$ where x is the number of citations. For large x -data Redner claims that a power law fit $N(x) \sim x^{-\alpha}$ where $\alpha \sim 3$ is more suitable.

Hirsh [8] reduced the complexity of the data distribution to quantify the importance of a scientist's research output into a single measure known as the *h-index*. Despite being controversial, the *h-index* is widely employed by many research funding agencies and universities all over the world. Hirsh's simple idea is that a publication is good as long as it is cited by other authors, i.e. "a scientist has index h if h of his N_p papers have at least h citations each. The other $(N_p - h)$ papers have $\leq h$ citations each, with $0 \leq h \leq N_p$. There are alternatives to the use of the *h-index* (see for example [3] who uses the total number of citations to quantify research performance). However, in this paper, we have opted to use the *h-index* because it has the advantage of being less prone to being inflated by a small number of big hits or by the eminence of co-authors. Since its proposal, it became widely accepted and has been employed as the basis for many scientometrics and bibliometrics research.

Another important point in the fields of computer science and engineering is that not only publications in journals are important. In those fields, publications in qualified conferences and workshops also play an important role [11]. Thus, the qualification of the conferences is important in order to enable a suitable evaluation of the researcher's production. The problem addressed in this paper is how to characterize and classify a group of researchers considering the individual *h-indexes* of its components. The method proposed here is based on the assumption that quality cannot be characterized just by a high average *h-index* for the group, but also by its homogeneity. Our rationale is: a group can have a high average *h-index* just by having one very productive researcher. However, a homogeneous group with an equivalent *h-index* will be better, as the homogeneity denotes greater robustness of the group.

In this paper, we introduce a new method to measure the scientific research output a group of researchers. The proposed method quantifies the quality of a group using a parameter that we call *α -index*. The algorithm for calculating the *α -index* will be described in further detail in Section 3. The *α -index* of a group is based on two concepts:

- (i) the *h-group*, which is an extension of the *h-index* for groups. It is measured by taking the maximum number of researchers in the group, satisfying *h-index* $\geq h$ -group. The remaining researchers in the group have *h-index* $< h$ -group;
- (ii) a known statistics employed to demonstrate the social inequality of a country, the Gini coefficient [2, 7].

Our method was designed to perform a fair comparison between groups with different sizes since different conferences will have different numbers of program committee members.

Although our method may be applied in other cases, in this particular paper the aim is to analyze the quality of computer science conferences and we show how to rank conferences based on the proposed *α -index*. It is important to mention that these results can be naturally extended to classify any other group of researchers for which

homogeneity is a desirable feature. For our example, bibliometric data of program committee members of seven conferences was collected and compiled. These data included the individual *h-index* of the members and the number of citations for their papers. The data was extracted using the free software “Publish or Perish”¹ which collects citation data from the Google Scholar service².

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes the collected conferences and their classification according to CAPES, a Brazilian federal agency responsible for evaluating the quality of university graduate programs. In this same section, we describe some statistical properties of the collected data and compare them to some expected results found in the literature. Section 3 shows how the Gini coefficient is a natural definition to measure the homogeneity of the program committees of scientific conferences in an analogy to the homogeneity of the wealth distribution in a population. We also define the *h-group* and the *α -index* of a group. In section 4, the main results are presented. Finally, in section 5 some conclusions are presented and extensions of the model are briefly discussed.

2 Preliminaries and previous statistics about conferences

CAPES [1] has defined a system for classifying the estimated quality of publication venues. The system is called *Qualis* and it grades venues into three categories A, B, or C. According to this grading scheme, A is the highest quality and it is usually assigned to top international conferences. The criteria analyzed include the number of editions of the conference and its acceptance rate. Table 1 shows data collected for 7 conferences.

Table 1. Conferences used for this work. The second column shows the average *h-index* for the program committee with the associated standard error ($\text{var}(h)/n$)^{1/2}

Conference	$\langle h \rangle \pm (\text{var}(h)/n)^{1/2}$	Committee size
CIKM-2005(A)	12.78±0.65	207
HSDM - 2005(C)	11.92±1.60	27
SEKE-2005(B)	11.63±1.55	67
Caise-2005(A)	10.10±0.66	102
ECDL-2005(B)	08.07±0.83	87
DOC-ENG -2005(A)	07.94±0.69	39
EASE-2005(C)	07.56±2.39	16

¹ <http://www.harzing.com/resources.htm>

² <http://scholar.google.com/>

The first step was to explore some preliminary statistics about these conferences. At this point, it is interesting to check similarities between the properties obtained from the program committee population and the properties expected from the general scientist's population. The first analysis was to plot the number of citations of the program committee members as function of their h -indexes. These plots are shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Citations versus h -index for conferences Qualis A, B and C.

In all cases presented in Figure 1, we found that the number of citations the authors has a quadratic dependence on their h -index, as expected in general scientific databases such as ISI (see for example [9, 10]). In order to measure the α exponent, we separated our data according to the classification of the conference (A, B or C) assigned CAPES. For each set of conferences, we analyzed the expected relation $x \sim h^\alpha$, where x is the number of citations of the author and h is the corresponding h -index. In a log-log plot, shown in Figure 1, we measured the slope. The results were $\alpha = 2.08(3)$, $2.12(3)$, and $2.15(6)$ for conferences A, B and C, respectively. This result corroborates Hirsh's theory [8] in which $\alpha = 2$.

We have also analyzed the distribution of citations for all conferences considered in order to explore other important features of the data compared to the general properties found in other scientific populations. Aiming at obtaining a larger sample, the analysis was performed taking all members of the program committee into consideration (combining A, B and C conferences). The idea was to verify whether the distribution of the number of citations, denoted by x , for members of program committees of computer science conferences follows a stretched exponential form (equation 1) as claimed by Laherrere and Sornette [9]. In their study, they found $\beta \sim 0.3$, which can be determined by plotting a histogram with the number of citations (x), as shown in Figure 2 (left plot).

$$N(x) = \exp\left[-(x/x_0)^\beta\right] \quad (1)$$




Figure 2 (Left plot) Experimental distribution of the number of citations for data obtained from conferences Qualis A, B and C. (Right plot) A comparison between the exact moments (equation 2) obtained for different β values and the real moment, i.e. obtained from the collected data (see equation 3).

Due to an imprecision in estimating β directly from the measure of the slope in the linear fit obtained from Figure 2 (Left plot) with $\log(\log(N(x)))$ as a function of $\log x$, we look at the exact ratio $M_k = \langle x^k \rangle / \langle x \rangle^k$, where $\langle x^k \rangle$ are the moments of the distribution given by equation 1. For example, when $k = 1$, $\langle x \rangle$ corresponds to the average of the distribution given by equation 1. The solution we adopted was to vary β so as to find the best approximation to M_k in relation to the experimental ratios R_k calculated by equation 3. Thus, the values for M_k can be analytically calculated and do not depend on the parameter x_0 :

$$M_k = \Gamma\left(\frac{k+1}{\beta}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{\beta}\right)^{k-1} / \Gamma\left(\frac{2}{\beta}\right)^k. \quad (2)$$

We then calculate M_k for values of k between 1 and 3, using a lag of $\Delta k = 0.1$, and different values of $\beta = 0.20, 0.22, \dots, 0.34$ (see right plot in Figure 2 – right plot) were considered in the search for a best match to the experimental ratio R_k given by equation 3.

$$R_k = \frac{1}{n^{k-1}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^k \right) / \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right)^k, \quad (3)$$

where n denotes the number of researchers and is represented by a continuous curve in the same plot. We can observe that the best match is found when $\beta = 0.28$, corroborating the expected behavior as described in Laherrere and Sornette [9].

This brief analysis shows that the statistical properties related to the distribution of the number of citations and its relationship with the *h-index* are similar to what is observed in other scientific societies.

Finally, in this section we analyze aspects related to the *h-index* distributions from members of program committees of Computer science conferences. A histogram of the *h-index* for all collected conferences is illustrated in fig. 3. Many empirical fits were tested (log-normal, gamma and other non-symmetric functions). Because of the characteristics of the data, a normal fit was not attempted. An excellent fit was found by using a function that comes from Chromatography literature, known as Giddings distribution [6], defined in equation 4.




Figure 3 - Histogram of the *h-index* of members of all collected conferences. The best fit was found by a Giddings function.

$$H(h) = H_0 + \frac{A}{w} \sqrt{\frac{h_c}{h}} I_1 \left(\frac{2\sqrt{h_c h}}{w} \right) \exp \left(\frac{-h - h_c}{w} \right), \quad (4)$$

where $I_1(x)$ is the modified Bessel function which is described in the integral form by $I_1(x) = (1/\pi) \int_0^\pi e^{x \cos \theta} \cos \theta d\theta$. Apart from the difficulty in analytically evaluating this function, the fit is numerical and easy to be performed. The fitted values were $H_0=0.912$, $h_c = 10.44$, $w = 2.518$ and $A = 1118.453$. The function given by equation 4 is the distribution in t representing the chance that one solute molecule will be eluted from the bottom of the column in a phenomena of passage of substances through a chromatographic column (see again [6]).

The results of this analysis show a non-symmetric distribution of the *h-index* in the program committee of the conferences. But is this indeed a good feature? In fact we expect a good conference to have a homogenous committee composed by young promising researchers with good *h-indexes* and also experienced researchers with a good *h-index* achieved through a sound scientific career. We do not consider a program committee composed by few leading scientists padded up with under-qualified researchers as good. Thus, in a second investigation, we have analyzed the *h-index* distribution for each conference. First, it would be interesting to know if any of the conferences has presents a normal distribution of the *h-indexes* of its program committee members. Using a traditional Shapiro–Wilk (SW) normality test, (see results in Table 2), we tested the normality level of each conference studied. The conferences DOCENG-2005 and XSDM-2005 (this last one is normal in a much lower level) were considered to be normally distributed, in a level of 5%.

Figure 4 shows a graphical comparison between the *h-index* histograms for DOCENG-2005, which is remarkably normal, and for ECDL-2005, which is remarkably non-normal.

Table 2 - Analysis of normality of program committee members.

Conference	Normality	<i>p</i> -value	Kurtosis	Skewness
Caixe-2005(A)	non-normal	0.00092	0.47117	0.70534
CIKM-2005(A)	non-normal	0.00000	9.57315	1.99863
DOCENG-2005(A)	normal	0.45027	-0.11212	0.40324
ECDL-2005(B)	non-normal	0.00000	2.63593	1.58998
SEKE-2005(B)	non-normal	0.00000	13.74526	3.14864
XSDM-2005(C)	normal	0.06612	-0.24953	0.63032
EASE-2005(C)	non-normal	0.00007	7.99799	2.15824

Table 2 also shows some other statistics. The third column presents the *p-values* (greatest value to be attributed to type 1 error for which the normality test would not be rejected). The fourth column shows the kurtosis, which is calculated as

in equation 5, and measures the weight of the tail of the distribution. The fifth column shows the skewness, which is calculated as in equation 6, and measures the symmetry of the distribution.

$$kurtosis = \frac{\langle (h - \langle h \rangle)^4 \rangle}{\langle (h - \langle h \rangle)^2 \rangle} - 3, \quad (5)$$

$$Skewness = \frac{\langle (h - \langle h \rangle)^3 \rangle}{\langle (h - \langle h \rangle)^2 \rangle^{3/2}}, \quad (6)$$

For a Gaussian distribution, we expect kurtosis and skewness to approach zero. We can observe that DOCENG is a conference that has a robust normal distribution characterized by a high p -value (0.45027). It presents a light tail ($kurtosis = -0.11212$) and a good symmetry ($skewness = 0.40324$) in relation to its mean value. As we will report in Section 4, DOCENG-2005 is the best conference according to the α -index, our proposed measure to classify conferences.




Figure 4 - Examples of h -index histograms for two conferences. The left plot shows a non-normal conference according to SW test. The plot on the right shows a conference that is clearly normal.

Holding an h -index distribution with a light tail and a high average h -index means that similar values of h -index are obtained in relation to the mean value. This homogeneity denotes a similarity in the h -indexes of the program committee members. This feature, together with a reasonable h -index definition for groups, are the main requirements for a good research group such as a program committee or an

editorial board of a journal. These aspects are explored in greater detail in the next sections.

3 The Gini Coefficient and the *h-index* of a group

The idea of a good group, in any instance, assumes the excellence of its components. For some groups, homogeneity is also desirable, i.e., the group should not only be composed by few productive members and filled up with unproductive components. We argue that homogeneity is a desirable feature for some research groups, especially for program committees and editorial boards as it assures a more uniform evaluation of the submitted papers. Following Braun [3], we agree that the eminence of gatekeepers is very important and relates to the level of the corresponding journal. In order to be admitted to the editorial board of a journal or to the program committee of a conference, the researcher should have reached a research status compatible to the venue's. Since publication venues have different requirement levels, one should "earn" the acceptance to be a referee in a specific publication venue. An interesting statistics to measure the equality of members in a group comes from the Social Economics literature, the Gini coefficient [2, 7].

In its original formulation, the Gini coefficient (which is a number in the interval [0, 1]) was designed to quantify inequalities in the distribution of wealth within a country. The lower the Gini coefficient, the more equal the wealth distribution. The highest known Gini coefficient is Namibia's (0.707) while the lowest is Iceland's (0.195) [4]. It is important to notice that a low Gini coefficient is positive for a country in which the population has buying power. Remarkably, countries such as Austria and Ethiopia have exactly the same Gini coefficient of 0.300. However, we know that this low Gini coefficient means something good for Austria (a homogeneously high living standard), but it means something bad for Ethiopia (a homogeneously low living standard).

The method for calculating the Gini coefficient takes the following process: first, a ranking of the members of the population must be disposed in increasing order of wealth (here replaced by the *h-index*), i.e., $h_1 < h_2 < \dots, h_{n-1} < h_n$. Let us consider equation 7 which calculates the fraction of wealth corresponding to the fraction of people $f_i = i/n, i = 1, \dots, n$.

$$\Phi(h_i) = \frac{1}{\left(\sum_{j=1}^n h_j \right)} \sum_{k=1}^i h_k \quad (7)$$

After applying equation 1 to each group, the curve $(\Phi(h_i), f_i)$ is generated. This curve is known as Lorenz curve [5]. In a totally fair society (or group), we should expect $\Phi(h_i) = i/n$, but in real societies this is not observed.

From that, we extend the Lorenz curve concept to describe inequalities in the h -index distribution of the scientific population. Figure 5 shows the Lorenz curve obtained for each conference described in section 2.




Figure 5 - Lorenz Curves of 7 studied conferences in this work.

We can observe that for each group, the area between the curve for each conference and the perfect h -index distribution represented by the continuous line (identity function $f_i = i/n$) measures the level of inequality in a conference's program committee.

This value is more suitably quantified by Gini statistics or simply by the Gini coefficient. This coefficient would be the aforementioned area duplicated, resulting in a value in the interval $[0,1]$. Theoretically, this coefficient is calculated as in equation 8.

$$g = 1 - 2 \int_0^1 \Phi(h) dh \quad (8)$$

Equation 8 is numerically approximated by a trapezoidal formula, leading to equation 9:

$$g = 1 - \frac{\Phi(h_0) + \Phi(h_n)}{n} - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \Phi(h_k) = 1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n [\Phi(h_k) + \Phi(h_{k-1})] \quad (9)$$

where $\Phi(h_0) = 0$ and $\Phi(h_n) = 1$ for construction.

We propose a new method to classify the quality of a group of researchers from the h -indexes of their members considering a fairer evaluation. This evaluation considers the magnitude of the h -index and the level of equality this h -index in the whole program committee population. This new definition, namely " α -index" is com-

posed by two different quantities: (i) the Gini coefficient of the h -index population, (ii) a definition of the relative h -index.

We consider that the h -index of a group with n members should be established by the maximum number of members that have an h -index equal to or higher than an integer h_{group} , and necessarily the remaining $(n - h_{\text{group}})$ members have an h -index lesser than h_{group} .

In practice, to find the h_{group} it suffices to plot the function $\psi(h_i) = n - i + 1$ (number of members that have an h -index higher than h_i) as a function of h_i and to determine the intercept between $\psi(h_i)$ and the identity function $\varphi(h_i) = h_i$ since $h_i < h_{i+1}$, for $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$ (see Figure 6).




Figure 6 - $n-i+1$ as a function of h_i , $i=1,..,n$ for two sample conferences. The intercept with the identity line corresponds to the h_{group} .

In general, conferences have different numbers of members in their program committees. Thus, in order to compare different groups we need to define a relative h_{group} which can be based on the smallest group to be compared. Let us imagine the simplest situation: two groups r_1 and r_2 with sizes respectively denoted by $|r_1|$ and $|r_2|$, with $|r_1| < |r_2|$. Denoting $H^{(2)} = \{h_1^{(2)}, h_2^{(2)}, \dots, h_{|r_2|}^{(2)}\}$ the set of h -indexes of members of group r_2 , we define the relative h_{group} of r_2 in relation to r_1 , over a number of samples (n_{sample}) as the value defined in equation 10:

$$h_{\text{group}}^{(r_1)}(r_2) = \frac{1}{n_{\text{sample}}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{\text{sample}}} h_{\text{group}}(S_j^{(r_1)} \subset H^{(2)}) \quad (10)$$

where $S_j^{(r_1)}$ denotes the j -th h -index sample of size $|r_1|$ randomly chosen in $H^{(2)}$. This normalization is required because the group r_2 theoretically should have maximum h -index = $|r_2|$ on the other hand r_1 should not. It is important to mention that our definition requires the collection of samples of “smallest group size” inside of larger groups in a way that groups of different sizes can be compared.

In case of $m > 2$ groups, a simple algorithm is proposed:

1. Input: m groups denoted by r_1, r_2, \dots, r_m , and number of samples (n_{sample}) are required;

2. The smallest group (r_k) is identified, i.e., $k = \arg \min_{l=1}^m \{ |r_l| \}$;

3. For each group indexed by $l = 1, \dots, m$, samples $S_j^{(r_k)}$ of h -index of size $|r_k|$ are randomly chosen in $H^{(l)} = \{h_1^{(l)}, h_2^{(l)}, \dots, h_{|r_l|}^{(l)}\}$, with $j = 1, \dots, n_{sample}$ and the relative h -group in relation to group r_k , i.e., $h_{group}^{(r_k)}(r_l)$ is calculated according to equation 10.

From that, a ranking for conferences (groups) can be established based on their relative h_{group} and the Gini coefficient. Our main proposed function, denoted by α -index, is employed to measure the quality of a group l among m groups. Equation 11 defines the α -index.

$$\alpha_l = \frac{h_{group}^{(r_k)}(r_l) / g_l}{\sum_{i=1}^m h_{group}^{(r_k)}(r_i) / g_i} \quad (11)$$

where $k = \arg \min_{l=1}^m \{ |r_l| \}$ and g_l is the Gini coefficient of group l . The value $0 \leq \alpha_l \leq 1$ measures the quality of a group based on a convenient definition of the h -index for groups weighed by the Gini coefficient of members in all groups considered for ranking. The factor g_l works as an amplifier factor of the relative h_{group} . The smaller the g_l the more significant the h_{group} .

In the next section, the experimental results of our proposed classification method using the α -index are presented.

4 Experiments

First, we have calculated the relative h_{group} of the groups based on the size of the smallest program committee among the studied conferences (EASE-2005, 16 members). For such a calculation, we used the simple algorithm presented in section 2. For our computations, we used $n_{sample} = 1000$. In table 3, we show our proposed ranking for the conferences according to the α -index.

Table 3 - Gini-Coefficient, h_{group} and α -index for seven analyzed conferences

Conference	Gini coefficient	h_{group}	Relative h_{group}	α -index
DOCENG-2005(A)	0.303	10	7.61	0.14108
CIKM-2005(A)	0.377	23	9.43	0.14051
CAISE-2005(A)	0.367	17	8.71	0.13333
HSDM-2005(C)	0.381	12	8.93	0.13166
SEKE-2005(B)	0.462	15	8.10	0.09849
ECDL-2005(B)	0.487	14	6.95	0.08017

EASE-2005(C)	0.548	6	6.00	0.06150
--------------	-------	---	------	---------

In these experiments, we found some interesting results that would not have been identified by simply taking the average of the *h-indexes* of the program committee members of a conference. Our *α-index* is capable of showing the need for the inclusion of the Gini coefficient or another equality parameter in the analysis of the quality of conferences. Many conferences have a high h_{group} due to a small fraction of researchers. This characteristic is not useful to establish the quality of the whole conference. The Brazilian Agency CAPES classifies conferences as A, B or C according to their quality. As for conference HSDM-2005, our classification differs from CAPES's. The agency uses a minimum number of editions as an attribute to determine the quality of the conference and this may have led to the incorrect ranking of HSDM-2005. Our approach does not depend on the number of editions of the conference as it analyzes the *h-index* distribution for a specific conference and this is one of its main advantages.

The ranking based on the *α-index* indicates the order of quality: DOC-ENG-2005(A), CIKM-2005(A), Caise-2005(A), HSDM-2005(C), SEKE-2005(B), ECDL-2005(B), and EASE-2005(C). Our results show a divergent ranking from the one that would be established by the simple calculation of the average of the *h-indexes*.

It is important to mention that the Gini coefficient shows how representative the computed h_{group} is. A low g denotes that the conference has a robust h_{group} . Furthermore, it means that any smaller sample collected in the group should have the same h_{group} making it independent of the sample. Conferences with a high Gini coefficient have discrepant program committee members, which evidences questionable quality.

Finally, other interesting instances for our approach could be easily experimented. For example, one could consider not only the *h-index* of the program committee members but also the *h-indexes* of the authors who have published papers in the conference. The difficulty here is the massive quantity of data required and its pre-processing.

5 Summary and Conclusions

This paper proposed a new method for classifying research groups in any scientific research area. Our method combines the concepts of homogeneity (Gini coefficient) and magnitude (relative h_{group}) to measure the quality of a group. Analyzing normal and non-normal groups of researchers, more specifically program committees of scientific conferences, we established a ranking for seven conferences. In addition, in a preliminary analysis we provided a detailed description of the statistical properties of the data.

Our results indicate that a fair classification should consider much more than simply a high average *h-index*. Characteristics such as the homogeneity of the group members, evidently with a reasonable *h-index*, should also be included in the criteria. Our results mostly agree with CAPES's classification scheme, but pointed out some shortcomings in the agency's classification, showing that a simple implementation of our method would yield a fairer ranking.

Moreover, the method may be employed to characterize the quality of a journal by collecting the *h-indexes* of member of its editorial board in a more restricted database such as ISI-JCR³. This work is under preparation. Our approach could also be used to establish a comparison between journals and conferences and maybe between research areas such as Computer science and Physics or even more distant fields such as Humanities and Exact Sciences.

5 Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for the helpful comments.

This research was partially supported by the Brazilian Research Council (CNPq) project OntoQUALIS. The first and second authors are partially supported by CNPq.

References

1. CAPES, <http://www.capes.gov.br/> accessed on: December 2008 (in Portuguese)
2. Gini Coefficient, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gini_coefficient accessed on: December 2008
3. Braun, T., *Keeping the Gates of Science Journals. Gatekeeping Indicators of National Performance in the Sciences*, in *Handbook of Quantitative Science and Technology Research*, H.F.e.a. Moed, Editor. 2004, Kluwer Academic Publishers: Dordrecht. p. 95-114.
4. Dorfman, R., *A Formula for the Gini Coefficient*. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 1979. **61**: p. 146-149.
5. Gastwirth, J.L., *The Estimation of the Lorenz Curve and Gini Index*. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 1972. **54**: p. 306-316.
6. Giddings, J.C. and Eyring, H., *A molecular dynamic theory of chromatography*. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1954. **59**: p. 416-421.
7. Gini, C., *Measurement of Inequality and Incomes*. *The Economic Journal*, 1921. **31**: p. 124-126.
8. Hirsch, J.E., *An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2005. **102**(46): p. 16569-16572.
9. Laherrere, J. and Sornette, D., *Stretched exponential distributions in nature and economy: fat tails with characteristic scales*. *Eur. Phys. J*, 1998. **B2**: p. 525-539.

³ <http://apps.isiknowledge.com/>

10. Redner, S., *How Popular is your paper? An Empirical Study of the Citation Distribution*. Eur. Phys. J, 1998. **B4**: p. 131-134.
11. Zhuang, Z., et al., *Measuring conference quality by mining program committee characteristics*, in *Proceedings of the 7th ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries*. 2007, ACM: Vancouver, Canada.