

# An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output

J. E. Hirsch

Department of Physics, University of California, San Diego  
La Jolla, CA 92093-0319

I propose the index  $h$ , defined as the number of papers with citation number higher or equal to  $h$ , as a useful index to characterize the scientific output of a researcher.

PACS numbers:

For the few scientists that earn a Nobel prize, the impact and relevance of their research work is unquestionable. Among the rest of us, how does one quantify the cumulative impact and relevance of an individual's scientific research output? In a world of not unlimited resources such quantification (even if potentially distasteful) is often needed for evaluation and comparison purposes, eg for university faculty recruitment and advancement, award of grants, etc.

The publication record of an individual and the citation record are clearly data that contain useful information. That information includes the number ( $N_p$ ) of papers published over  $n$  years, the number of citations ( $N_c^j$ ) for each paper ( $j$ ), the journals where the papers were published and their impact parameter, etc. This is a large amount of information that will be evaluated with different criteria by different people. Here I would like to propose a single number, the "h-index", as a particularly simple and useful way to characterize the scientific output of a researcher.

*A scientist has index  $h$  if  $h$  of his/her  $N_p$  papers have at least  $h$  citations each, and the other ( $N_p - h$ ) papers have fewer than  $h$  citations each.*

The research reported here concentrated on physicists, however I suggest that the  $h$ -index should be useful for other scientific disciplines as well. (At the end of the paper I discuss some observations for the  $h$ -index in biological sciences.) The highest  $h$  among physicists appears to be E. Witten's,  $h = 110$ . That is, Witten has written 110 papers with at least 110 citations each. That gives a lower bound on the total number of citations to Witten's papers at  $h^2 = 12,100$ . Of course the total number of citations ( $N_{c,tot}$ ) will usually be much larger than  $h^2$ , since  $h^2$  both underestimates the total number of citations of the  $h$  most cited papers and ignores the papers with fewer than  $h$  citations. The relation between  $N_{c,tot}$  and  $h$  will depend on the detailed form of the particular distribution [1, 2], and it is useful to define the proportionality constant  $a$  as

$$N_{c,tot} = ah^2. \quad (1)$$

I find empirically that  $a$  ranges between 3 and 5.

Other prominent physicists with high  $h$ 's are M.L. Cohen ( $h = 94$ ), P.W. Anderson ( $h = 91$ ), S. Weinberg ( $h = 88$ ), M.E. Fisher ( $h = 88$ ), M. Cardona ( $h = 86$ ), P.G. deGennes ( $h = 79$ ), J.N. Bahcall ( $h = 77$ ), Z. Fisk ( $h = 75$ ), D.J. Scalapino ( $h = 75$ ), G. Parisi ( $h = 73$ ),

S.G. Louie ( $h = 70$ ), R. Jackiw ( $h = 69$ ), F. Wilczek ( $h = 68$ ), C. Vafa ( $h = 66$ ), M.B. Maple ( $h = 66$ ), D.J. Gross ( $h = 66$ ), M.S. Dresselhaus ( $h = 62$ ), S.W. Hawking ( $h = 62$ ).

I argue that  $h$  is preferable to other single-number criteria commonly used to evaluate scientific output of a researcher, as follows:

(0) Total number of papers ( $N_p$ ): Advantage: measures productivity. Disadvantage: does not measure importance nor impact of papers.

(1) Total number of citations ( $N_{c,tot}$ ): Advantage: measures total impact. Disadvantage: hard to find; may be inflated by a small number of 'big hits', which may not be representative of the individual if he/she is coauthor with many others on those papers. In such cases the relation Eq. (1) will imply a very atypical value of  $a$ , larger than 5. Another disadvantage is that  $N_{c,tot}$  gives undue weight to highly cited review articles versus original research contributions.

(2) Citations per paper, i.e. ratio of  $N_{c,tot}$  to  $N_p$ : Advantage: allows comparison of scientists of different ages. Disadvantage: hard to find; rewards low productivity, penalizes high productivity.

(3) Number of 'significant papers', defined as the number of papers with more than  $y$  citations, for example  $y = 50$ . Advantage: eliminates the disadvantages of criteria (0), (1), (2), gives an idea of broad and sustained impact. Disadvantage:  $y$  is arbitrary and will randomly favor or disfavor individuals;  $y$  needs to be adjusted for different levels of seniority.

(4) Number of citations to each of the  $q$  most cited papers, for example  $q = 5$ . Advantage: overcomes many of the disadvantages of the criteria above. Disadvantage: it is not a single number, making it more difficult to obtain and compare. Also,  $q$  is arbitrary and will randomly favor and disfavor individuals.

Instead, the proposed  $h$ -index measures the broad impact of an individual's work; it avoids all the disadvantages of the criteria listed above; it usually can be found very easily, by ordering papers by 'times cited' in the ISI database; it gives a ballpark estimate of the total number of citations, Eq. (1).

Thus I argue that two individuals with similar  $h$  are comparable in terms of their overall scientific impact, even if their total number of papers or their total number of citations is very different. Conversely, that between two individuals (of the same scientific age) with similar

number of total papers or of total citation count and very different  $h$ -values, the one with the higher  $h$  is likely to be the 'better' scientist.

For a given individual one expects that  $h$  should increase approximately linearly with time. In the simplest possible model, assume the researcher publishes  $p$  papers per year and each published paper earns  $c$  new citations per year every subsequent year. The total number of citations after  $n + 1$  years is then

$$N_{c,tot} = \sum_{j=1}^n pcj = \frac{pcn(n+1)}{2} \quad (2)$$

Assuming all papers up to year  $y$  contribute to the index  $h$  we have

$$(n - y)c = h \quad (3a)$$

$$py = h \quad (3b)$$

hence

$$h = \frac{c}{1 + c/p}n \quad (4)$$

The total number of citations (for not too small  $n$ ) is then approximately

$$N_{c,tot} \sim \frac{(1 + c/p)^2}{2c/p} h^2 \quad (5)$$

of the form Eq. (1). The coefficient  $a$  depends on the number of papers and the number of citations per paper earned per year as given by eq. (5). As stated earlier we find empirically that  $a \sim 3$  to  $5$  are typical values. The linear relation

$$h \sim mn \quad (6)$$

should hold quite generally for scientists that produce papers of similar quality at a steady rate over the course of their careers, of course  $m$  will vary widely among different researchers. In the simple linear model,  $m$  is related to  $c$  and  $p$  as given by eq. (4). Quite generally, the slope of  $h$  versus  $n$ , the parameter  $m$ , should provide a useful yardstick to compare scientists of different seniority.

In the linear model, the minimum value of  $a$  in Eq. (1) is  $a = 2$ , for the case  $c = p$ , where the papers with more than  $h$  citations and those with less than  $h$  citations contribute equally to the total  $N_{c,tot}$ . The value of  $a$  will be larger for both  $c > p$  and  $c < p$ . For  $c > p$ , most contributions to the total number of citations arise from the 'highly cited papers' (the  $h$  papers that have  $N_c > h$ ), while for  $c < p$  it is the sparsely cited papers (the  $N_p - h$  papers that have fewer than  $h$  citations each) that give the largest contribution to  $N_{c,tot}$ . We find that the first situation holds in the vast majority, if not all, cases. For the linear model defined in this example,  $a = 4$




FIG. 1: The intersection of the 45 degree line with the curve giving the number of citations versus the paper number gives  $h$ . The total number of citations is the area under the curve. Assuming the second derivative is non-negative everywhere, the minimum area is given by the distribution indicated by the dotted line, yielding  $a=2$  in Eq. 1.

corresponds to  $c/p = 5.83$  (the other value that yields  $a = 4$ ,  $c/p = 0.17$ , is unrealistic).

The linear model defined above corresponds to the distribution

$$N_c(y) = N_0 - \left(\frac{N_0}{h} - 1\right)y \quad (7)$$

where  $N_c(y)$  is the number of citations to the  $y$ -th paper (ordered from most to least cited), and  $N_0$  is the number of citations of the most highly cited paper ( $N_0 = cn$  in the example above). The total number of papers  $y_m$  is given by  $N_c(y_m) = 0$ , hence

$$y_m = \frac{N_0 h}{N_0 - h} \quad (8)$$

We can write  $N_0$  and  $y_m$  in terms of  $a$  defined in Eq. (1) as :

$$N_0 = h[a \pm \sqrt{a^2 - 2a}] \quad (9a)$$

$$y_m = h[a \mp \sqrt{a^2 - 2a}] \quad (9b)$$

For  $a = 2$ ,  $N_0 = y_m = 2h$ . For larger  $a$ , the upper sign in Eq. (9) corresponds to the case where the highly cited papers dominate (more realistic case) and the lower sign where the low-cited papers dominate the total citation count.

In a more realistic model,  $N_c(y)$  will not be a linear function of  $y$ . Note that  $a = 2$  can safely be assumed to be a lower bound quite generally, since a smaller value of  $a$  would require the second derivative  $\partial^2 N_c / \partial y^2$  to be negative over large regions of  $y$  which is not realistic. The total number of citations is given by the area under the  $N_c(y)$  curve, that passes through the point  $N_c(h) = h$ . In the linear model the lowest  $a = 2$  corresponds to the line of slope  $-1$ , as shown in Figure 1.

A more realistic model would be a stretched exponential of the form

$$N_c(y) = N_0 e^{-\left(\frac{y}{y_0}\right)^\beta}. \quad (10)$$

Note that for  $\beta \leq 1$ ,  $N_c''(y) > 0$  for all  $y$ , hence  $a > 2$  is true. We can write the distribution in terms of  $h$  and  $a$  as

$$N_c(y) = \frac{a}{\alpha I(\beta)} h e^{-\left(\frac{y}{h\alpha}\right)^\beta} \quad (11)$$

with  $I(\beta)$  the integral

$$I(\beta) = \int_0^\infty dz e^{-z^\beta} \quad (12)$$

and  $\alpha$  determined by the equation

$$\alpha e^{\alpha^{-\beta}} = \frac{a}{I(\beta)} \quad (13)$$

The maximally cited paper has citations

$$N_0 = \frac{a}{\alpha I(\beta)} h \quad (14)$$

and the total number of papers (with at least one citation) is determined by  $N(y_m) = 1$  as

$$y_m = h[1 + \alpha^\beta \ln(h)]^{1/\beta} \quad (15)$$

A given researcher's distribution can be modeled by choosing the most appropriate  $\beta$  and  $a$  for that case. For example, for  $\beta = 1$ , if  $a = 3$ ,  $\alpha = 0.661$  and  $N_0 = 4.54h$ ,  $y_m = h[1 + .66 \ln h]$ . With  $a = 4$ ,  $\alpha = 0.4644$ ,  $N_0 = 8.61h$  and  $y_m = h[1 + 0.46 \ln(h)]$ . For  $\beta = 0.5$ , the lowest possible value of  $a$  is 3.70; for that case,  $N_0 = 7.4h$ ,  $y_m = h[1 + 0.5 \ln(h)]^2$ . Larger  $a$  values will increase  $N_0$  and reduce  $y_m$ . For  $\beta = 2/3$ , the smallest possible  $a$  is  $a = 3.24$ , for which case  $N_0 = 4.5h$  and  $y_m = h[1 + 0.66 \ln(h)]^{3/2}$ .

The linear relation between  $h$  and  $n$  Eq. (6) will of course break down when the researcher slows down in paper production or stops publishing altogether. There is a time lag between the two events. In the linear model assuming the researcher stops publishing after  $n_{stop}$  years,  $h$  continues to increase at the same rate for a time

$$n_{lag} = \frac{h}{c} = \frac{1}{1 + c/p} n_{stop} \quad (16)$$

and then stays constant, since now all published papers contribute to  $h$ . In a more realistic model  $h$  will smoothly level off as  $n$  increases rather than with a discontinuous change in slope. Still quite generally the time lag will be larger for scientists who have published for many years as Eq. (16) indicates.

Furthermore in reality of course not all papers will eventually contribute to  $h$ . Some papers with low citations will never contribute to a researcher's  $h$ , especially if written late in the career when  $h$  is already appreciable.

As discussed by Redner[3], most papers earn their citations over a limited period of popularity and then they are no longer cited. Hence it will be the case that papers that contributed to a researcher's  $h$  early in his/her career will no longer contribute to  $h$  later in the individual's career. Nevertheless it is of course always true that  $h$  cannot decrease with time. The paper or papers that at any given time have exactly  $h$  citations are at risk of being eliminated from the individual's  $h$ -count as they are superseded by other papers that are being cited at a higher rate. It is also possible that papers 'drop out' and then later come back into the  $h$ -count, as would occur for the kind of papers termed 'sleeping beauties'[4].

For the individual researchers mentioned earlier I find  $n$  from the time elapsed since their first published paper till the present, and find the following values for the slope  $m$  defined in Eq. (6): Witten,  $m = 3.89$ ; Cohen,  $m = 2.24$ ; Anderson,  $m = 1.88$ ; Weinberg,  $m = 1.76$ ; Fisher,  $m = 1.91$ ; Cardona,  $m = 1.87$ ; deGennes,  $m = 1.75$ ; Bahcall,  $m = 1.75$ ; Fisk,  $m = 2.14$ ; Scalapino,  $m = 1.88$ ; Parisi,  $m = 2.15$ ; Louie,  $m = 2.33$ ; Jackiw,  $m = 1.92$ ; Wilczek,  $m = 2.19$ ; Vafa,  $m = 3.30$ ; Maple,  $m = 1.94$ ; Gross,  $m = 1.69$ ; Dresselhaus,  $m = 1.41$ ; Hawking,  $m = 1.59$ . From inspection of the citation records of many physicists I conclude:

- (1) A value  $m \sim 1$ , i.e. an  $h$  index of 20 after 20 years of scientific activity, characterizes a successful scientist.
- (2) A value  $m \sim 2$ , i.e. an  $h$ -index of 40 after 20 years of scientific activity, characterizes outstanding scientists, likely to be found only at the top universities or major research laboratories.
- (3) A value  $m \sim 3$  or higher, i.e. an  $h$ -index of 60 after 20 years, or 90 after 30 years, characterizes truly unique individuals.

The  $m$ -parameter ceases to be useful if a scientist does not maintain his/her level of productivity, while the  $h$ -parameter remains useful as a measure of cumulative achievement that may continue to increase over time even long after the scientist has stopped publishing altogether.

Based on typical  $h$  and  $m$  values found, I suggest that (with large error bars) for faculty at research universities  $h \sim 12$  should be a typical value for advancement to tenure (associate professor), and  $h \sim 18$  for advancement to full professor. Fellowship in the American Physical Society should occur typically for  $h \sim 15$  to 20. Membership in the US National Academy of Sciences should typically be associated with  $h \sim 45$  and higher except in exceptional circumstances. Note that these estimates correspond roughly to typical number of years of sustained research production assuming an  $m \sim 1$  value, the time scales of course will be shorter for scientists with higher  $m$  values. Note that the time estimates are taken from the publication of the first paper which typically occurs some years before the Ph.D. is earned.

As an interesting sample population I computed  $h$  and  $m$  for the physicists that obtained Nobel prizes in the last 20 years (for calculating  $m$  I used the latter of the first published paper year or 1955, the first year in the




FIG. 2: Histogram giving number of Nobel-prize recipients in Physics in the last 20 years versus their  $h$ -index. The peak is at  $h$ -index between 35 and 39.

ISI database). However the set was further restricted by including only the names that uniquely identified the scientist in the ISI citation index. This restricted our set to 76% of the total, it is however still an unbiased estimator since the commonality of the name should be uncorrelated with  $h$  and  $m$ .  $h$ -indices range from 22 to 79,  $m$ -indices from 0.47 to 2.19. Averages and standard deviations are  $\langle h \rangle = 41$ ,  $\sigma_h = 15$ , and  $\langle m \rangle = 1.14$ ,  $\sigma_m = 0.47$ . The distribution of  $h$ -indices is shown in Figure 2, the median is at  $h_m = 35$ , lower than the mean due to the tail for high  $h$  values. It is interesting that Nobel prize winners have substantial  $h$  indices (84% had  $h$  of at least 30), indicating that Nobel prizes do not originate in one stroke of luck but in a body of scientific work. Notably the values of  $m$  found are often not high compared to other successful scientists (49% of our sample had  $m < 1$ ). This is clearly because Nobel prizes are often awarded long after the period of maximum productivity of the researchers.

As another example, among newly elected members in the National Academy of Sciences in Physics and Astronomy in 2005 I find  $\langle h \rangle = 44$ ,  $\sigma_h = 14$ , highest  $h = 71$ , lowest  $h = 20$ , median  $h_m = 46$ . Among the

total membership in NAS in Physics the subgroup of last names starting with A and B has  $\langle h \rangle = 38$ ,  $\sigma_h = 10$ ,  $h_m = 37$ . These examples further indicate that the index  $h$  is a stable and consistent estimator of scientific achievement.

Finally, I discuss some observations in the fields of biological and biomedical sciences. From the list compiled by Christopher King of Thomson ISI of the most highly cited scientists in the period 1983-2002[5], I found the  $h$ -indices for the top 10 on that list, all in the life sciences, which are, in order of decreasing  $h$ : S.H. Snyder,  $h = 191$ ; D. Baltimore,  $h = 160$ ; R.C. Gallo,  $h = 154$ ; P. Chambon,  $h = 153$ ; B. Vogelstein,  $h = 151$ ; S. Moncada,  $h = 143$ ; C.A. Dinarello,  $h = 138$ ; T. Kishimoto,  $h = 134$ ; R. Evans,  $h = 127$ ; A. Ullrich,  $h = 120$ . It can be seen that not surprisingly all these highly cited researchers also have high  $h$ -indices, and that high  $h$ -indices in the life sciences are much higher than in physics. Among 36 new inductees in the National Academy of Sciences in biological and biomedical sciences in 2005 I find  $\langle h \rangle = 57$ ,  $\sigma_h = 22$ , highest  $h = 135$ , lowest  $h = 18$ , median  $h_m = 57$ . These latter results confirm that  $h$ -indices in biological sciences tend to be higher than in physics, however they also indicate that the difference appears to be much higher at the high end than on average. Clearly more research in understanding similarities and differences of  $h$ -index distributions in different fields of science would be of interest.

In summary, I have proposed an easily computable index,  $h$ , which gives an estimate of the importance, significance and broad impact of a scientist's cumulative research contributions. I suggest that this index should provide a useful yardstick to compare different individuals competing for the same resource when an important evaluation criterion is scientific achievement, in an unbiased way.

### Acknowledgments

I am grateful to many colleagues in the UCSD Condensed Matter group and especially Ivan Schuller for stimulating discussions on these topics and encouragement to publish these ideas.

- 
- [1] J. Laherrere and D. Sornette, Eur .Phys. J. B 2, 525 (1998).  
 [2] S. Redner, Eur .Phys. J. B 4, 131 (1998).  
 [3] S. Redner, Physics Today Vol. 58, No. 6, p. 49 (2005).

- [4] A.F.J. van Raan, Scientometrics **59**, 467 (2004).  
 [5] As reported in the newspaper "The Guardian", Thursday, September 25, 2003.