

Is it possible to compare researchers with different scientific interests?

Pablo D. Batista,¹ Mônica G. Campiteli,¹
Osame Kinouchi,¹ and Alexandre S. Martinez¹

¹*Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras de Ribeirão Preto, Universidade de São Paulo*

*Avenida Bandeirantes, 3900
14040-901, Ribeirão Preto, SP, Brazil.
monicacampiteli@pg.ffclrp.usp.br*

The number h of papers with at least h citations has been proposed to evaluate individual's scientific research production. This index is robust in several ways but yet strongly dependent on the research field. We propose a complementary index $h_I = h / \langle N_a \rangle = h^2 / N_a^{(T)}$, with $N_a^{(T)}$ being the total number of authors in the considered h papers. A researcher with index h_I has h_I papers with at least h_I citation if he/she had published alone. We have obtained the rank plots of h and h_I for four Brazilian scientific communities. Contrasting to the h -index curve, the h_I index present a perfect data collapse into a unique allowing comparison among different research areas.

1. INTRODUCTION

New proposals for the scientific research output evaluation have been suggested recently^{1,3}. In particular, Hirsch^{1,4,5,6,7} has proposed a new scalar index h to quantify individual's scientific research output. A researcher with index h has h papers with at least h citations. This index has several advantages: (i) it combines productivity with impact, (ii) the necessary data is easy to access in Thompson ISI Web of Science database, (iii) it is not sensitive to extreme values, (iv) it is hard to inflate, (v) automatically samples the most relevant papers concerning citations, etc. This index is

related to extremal statistics, which is dominated by exponential density distributions, meaning that high h values are difficult to achieve. Nevertheless, this index remains very sensitive to the research field. In fact, Hirsch¹ has shown that the top ten in physics and biology have very different h indexes. The highest physicist (Witten E) has h value equal to 110, while in the life sciences highest h value (Snyder SH) is 192. Even inside a given discipline, say Theoretical and High Energy Physics, it would be hard to compare scientific research output. Further, since h is an integer number, many researchers may have the same index h , so that discriminating or listing them becomes highly arbitrary, demanding further criteria.

To circumvent these problems it would be interesting that the h index could account for the differences among disciplines. In recent papers, it has been shown that the number of citations a paper receives can be influenced by the number of authors⁸. Since: (i) the greater the number of authors, the greater the number of self-citations and (ii) the co-authorship behavior is characteristic of each discipline, we have proposed a complementary index h_I to quantify an individual's scientific research output valid across disciplines⁹. The statistics of h and h_I are presented for the fundamental research fields in Brazil. Contrasting to h rank plots, we have shown that the relative h_I rank plots collapse into a single unique curve. This universal behavior suggests that it could be used to compare scientific research output performance in different research fields.

2. METHODOLOGY

From Thomson ISI Web of Science database, we have considered the Brazilian scientific research output in four different fields: Physics, Chemistry, Biology/Biomedical and Mathematics. The database has been compiled from the database of the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI). The search has been conducted

using the query “Brazil OR Brasil” in the address field. This means that it has been accounted all the documents with at least one Brazilian address with citations till June 2005. Researcher nationality and researches done by Brazilians abroad (foreigner address) are disregarded in the considered database. We have considered all documents published from 1945 to 2004. The search has been performed separately for each year.

We have chosen the Brazilian institutions for this work due to the fact that the ISI Web of Science limits the searching to 100,000 papers, being thus impossible to compile a complete database for countries that have a greater annual productivity as the United States of America. Our database contains information of about 188,909 bibliographical references. This information includes type of publication, full reference, citations received, authors' names and addresses, including the institutions, cities, states and country. Among all publications, we have considered 150,323 articles, 24,164 meeting abstracts, 5,541 notes, 3,577 letters and 2,333 reviews. Documents have been classified into the research fields using the *tag subject*. Then four lists have been compiled containing author name, publication number, times cited and number of authors. Notice that a given researcher can appear in more than one list.

3. RESULTS

Figure 1 shows the number N of researchers with index h for the four different disciplines. The $N(h)$ distributions for different fields are apparently exponentials (not fitted). Notice however, that in Physics there exist many more researchers with $h > 10$ than the other research areas, making it more power-law like. The research fields Chemistry and Biology behave similarly.

Our data set shows that, in general biologists/biomedical researchers have smaller h than physicists, in contrast to Hirsch's observations about worldwide data ¹. This may be due to the lack of financial support to sustain the experimental nature of Biology. Further, in Physics, computer and theoretical physics, which are less demanding areas, may play an important role in the mentioned trend.




Figure 1. Number of researchers with h index in four different research fields (● Physics, ■ Chemistry, □ Biology/Biomedical and ▲ Mathematics) in Brazil.

The distributions of papers with k authors are shown in Fig. 2. One sees that the maximum of the distributions is at $k_{max} = 2$ for physics, biology and mathematics, being $k_{max} = 3$ for chemistry. Nevertheless, Physics have several papers with more than 50 authors. These papers probably reflect collaborations with large international teams ¹⁰. Notice also that Mathematics presents the greater proportion of a single author papers.

We have verified that citation distributions can be fitted either by known curves, as previously reported ^{11, 12} (inset of Fig. 2). Also, we have empirically verified that the total number of citations ($N_{C_{tot}}$) approaches ah^2 (not shown), as conjectured in Ref ¹.




Figure 2. Number of publication with k authors per article in four research fields (● Physics, ■ Chemistry, □ Biology/Biomedical and ▲ Mathematics) in Brazil. **Inset:** Number $N(N_c)$ of publications cited N_c times in four research fields in Brazil from 1945 to 2004 (citations collected till June 2005).

The top h -researchers in our data set are displayed in Table I. From this Table, one sees that it is very difficult to compare researchers from different fields. However, we have noticed a strong correlation between h and the number of authors that sign the top h publications.

PHYSICS						CHEMISTRY					
NAME	University	h	N_c	N_a	N	NAME	University	h	N_c	N_a	N
Eppley, G	*	37	4938	13172	163	Zagatto, EAG	USP	29	2770	143	116
Fisyak, Y	*	37	4732	13218	156	Toma, HE	USP	28	2869	70	173
Read, AL	*	36	5794	17095	230	Krug, FJ	USP	28	1936	139	62
Tsallis, C	CBPF	35	5946	83	219	Reis, BF	USP	26	2257	132	110
Yang, J	*	35	3956	12458	83	Comasseto, JV	USP	25	2095	74	101
Yepes, P	*	35	3677	13415	120	Dupont, J	UFRGS	23	2378	111	76
Alves, GA	CBPF	34	3812	11107	136	Airoidi, C	Unicamp	22	2093	50	220
Verbeure, F	*	34	5153	13940	273	Chaimovich, H	USP	22	1642	102	68
Smirnov, N	*	34	4394	15365	174	Bergamin, H	USP	21	1508	105	34
over 100		33				Gushikem, Y	Unicamp	21	1339	64	120
almost 300		32				Castellano, EE	USP	20	1338	128	171
						Eberlin, MN	Unicamp	20	1255	87	108
						Martins, MAP	UFMS	20	1006	107	68
						Kubota, LT	Unicamp	19	1159	64	112
BIOLOGICAL / BIOMEDICAL						MATHEMATICS					
deSouza, W	UFRJ	24	2134	87	157	Mane, R.	IMPA	14	509	19	21
Gottlieb, OR	UFF	24	2657	87	222	Iusem, AN	IMPA	13	471	28	48
Dobereiner, J	UFRRJ	19	867	90	34	Martinez, JM	Unicamp	12	495	30	74
Salzano, FM	UFRGS	18	874	107	82	Defigueiredo, DG	Unicamp	12	516	24	25
Arruda, P	Unicamp	18	820	85	52	Simis, A	UFPE	11	393	29	39
Vercesi, AE	Unicamp	17	1077	69	74	Dajczer, M	IMPA	10	317	22	56
Laurance, WF	INPA	16	820	124	37	Palis, J	IMPA	9	230	17	19
Jones, RN	Unifesp	16	969	98	44	Costa, DG	UNB	9	193	18	20
Yoshida, M	USP	15	737	60	71	Svaiter, BF	IMPA	9	259	21	34
Oliveira, OS	Unicamp	14	385	34	25	Garcia, A	IMPA	9	298	20	37
Curi, R.	USP	14	731	65	128	Vasconcelos WV	*	9	296	25	16
Sader, H S	*	14	825	97	41	Telles, JCF	UFSC	9	311	21	22
Trabulsi, LR	USP	14	787	68	83						
Junqueira LCU	USP	14	1148	52	32						
Graeff FG	USP	13	556	36	46						

Table I: The top h -ranking for the four fields. The numbers are (from left to right) the h index, total number of citations in the h papers, number of authors in the h papers and total number of papers published by the author. Authors marked with (*) are associated to foreign institutions but appear in the list because of the Brazilian collaboration in the h papers.

To account for the coauthorship effect, divide h by the mean number of researchers in the h publications $\langle N_a \rangle = N_a^{(T)} / h$, where $N_a^{(T)}$ is the total number of authors (author multiple occurrences are allowed) in the considered h papers. Thus, we obtain a new index:

$$h_I = h / \langle N_a \rangle = h^2 / N_a^{(T)} \quad (1)$$

which gives further information about the research output.

The rationale for this procedure is that we want to measure the effective individual average productivity. More authors could produce more future self-citations which may produce statistical biases. If a given researcher is the only author in his/her h papers, then $N_a^{(T)} = h$ and $h_I = h$ in this case. The h_I index indicates the number of papers a researcher would have written alone along his/her carrier with at least h_I citations. Once h has been computed, the h_I index is also easy to compute from the Thompson ISI Web of Science. The rank plots of h (inset of Fig. 3) and h_I (Fig. 3) are strongly different.




FIG. 3: The index h_I as a function of the ranking R for the brazilian research fields (\bullet Physics, \blacksquare Chemistry, \square Biology/Biomedical and \blacktriangle Mathematics). The h_I curves, in contrast to h curves, have the same functional shape. **Inset:** The same for the index h .

Figure 3 presents the h_l indices in a decreasing ranking plotted against the respective number of realizations. Physics rank plot is practically constant for the first 1000 h -ranks, presenting an abrupt decay afterwards. This rank plot drastically differs from the rank plot of other considered fields. The h_l rank plot is much smoother and, importantly, all the distributions are more similar among themselves, being close to stretched exponentials (straight line in the linear-log plot)¹³. This similarity displays the emergence of a universal behavior.




FIG. 4: The index $h_l / \langle h_l \rangle$ as a function of the ranking R / R_{\max} in four different research fields (● Physics, ■ Chemistry, □ Biology/Biomedical and ▲ Mathematics) in Brazil. A single unique curve is found permitting comparisons among different research fields. **Inset:** Data collapse is not obtained for h curves because of the co-authorship effects in Physics.

The functional similarity of the h_l rank plots has motivated us to scale the variables. With this aim, we have divided each h_l curve by its mean values and the ranks

have been divided by the size of the community (maximum rank). The scaled variables are plotted in Fig. 4, where the data collapse is shown by a single unique curve. This universal curve is not observed for the relative h index (inset - Fig.4) since the co-authorship effects exclude Physics.

The use of the mean value in the definition of h_I index could penalize authors with eventual papers with large number of authors, since the mean is a measure very sensitive to extremum values. A possible correction to this factor is to consider the median or harmonic mean instead of the mean value. In fact, we have observed a strong correlation ($r = 0.93$) between the rankings using the mean value and median measures.

PHYSICS							CHEMISTRY						
NAME	University	h_I	h	N_c	N_a	N	NAME	University	h_I	h	N_c	N_a	N
Tsallis, C	CBPF	14.8	35	5946	82	219	Toma, HE	USP	11.2	28	869	69	173
Berkovits, N	Unesp	10.8	20	1101	36	57	Airoldi, C	Unicamp	9.7	22	93	49	220
Letelier, PS	Unicamp	10.7	17	1156	26	113	Comasseto, JV	USP	8.4	25	95	73	101
Adhikari, S K	Unesp	9.5	20	1423	41	182	Gushikem, Y	Unicamp	6.9	21	339	63	120
Alcaraz, FC	USP	7.7	20	1060	51	74	Petragnani, N	USP	6.0	17	330	47	50
Lemos, JPS	UFRJ	7.5	14	548	25	32	Zagatto, EAG	USP	5.9	29	770	142	116
Nunes, OAC	UNB	7.1	10	338	13	81	Riveros, JM	USP	5.8	15	70	38	57
Hipolito, O	USP	7.0	18	919	45	75	Kubota, LT	Unicamp	5.6	19	159	63	112
Sarmiento, EF	UFAL	6.8	20	996	58	56	Krug, FJ	USP	5.6	28	936	138	62
Swieca JA	UFSCar	6.7	16	714	37	20	Fatibello, O	UFSCar	5.4	13	46	30	69
BIOLOGICAL / BIOMEDICAL							MATHEMATICS						
Gottlieb, OR	UFF	6.6	24	2657	86	222	Mane, R	IMPA	10.3	14	509	18	21
deSouza, W	UFRJ	6.6	24	2134	86	157	Iusem, AN	IMPA	6.04	13	471	27	48
Oliveira, PS	Unicamp	5.8	14	385	33	25	Defigueiredo D	Unicamp	6.0	12	516	23	25
Graeff, FG	USP	4.7	13	556	35	46	Martinez, JM	Unicamp	4.80	12	495	29	74
Mello MLS	Unicamp	4.6	11	406	25	77	Palis, J	IMPA	4.76	9	230	16	19
Ferreira, SH	USP	4.33	13	1017	38	70	Dajczer, M	IMPA	4.54	10	317	21	56
Peres, CA	USP	4.27	8	254	14	14	Costa, DG	UNB	4.50	9	193	17	20
Vercesi, AE	Unicamp	4.2	17	1077	68	74	Simis, A	UFPE	4.2	11	393	28	39
Lacazvieira, F	USP	4.05	9	133	19	34	Garcia, A	IMPA	4.05	9	298	19	37
Dobereiner, J	UFRRJ	4.01	19	867	89	34	Gonzaga, CC	UFSC	4	6	188	8	15

Table II: The top h_I -ranking for the four fields. The numbers are (from left to right) the h_I index, h index, total number of citations in the h papers, number of authors and total number of papers published by the author.

The top ten h_I -researchers in the Brazilian database are shown in Table II. The overlaps between the h and h_I lists are: 10% for Physics, 60% for Chemistry, 50% for Biology and 90% for Mathematics.

4. CONCLUSION

The index h_I is complementary to h and indicates the number of papers a researcher would have written along his/her career with at least h_I citations if he/she has worked alone. It diminishes the h degenerescency and has the advantage of being less sensitive to different research fields. This allows a less biased comparison due to the consideration of co-authorship effects. The h ranking studied takes into account publications that have at least one author with Brazilian address and presented strong differences in functional form between fields say, Physics and Mathematics. Such differences are softened for h_I , where data collapse has been found with the appropriate scaling. This universal behavior allows comparisons among different fields. It may be interesting to perform this study for other countries and other instances as department evaluations, periodic publications etc.

Acknowledge: This work was supported by CAPES, CNPq and FAPESP.

Reference:

- [1] J. E. Hirsch, *An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output*, physics/0508025 (2005).
- [2] S. B. Popov, *A parameter to quantify dynamics of a researcher's scientific activity*, physics/0508113.
- [3] D. F. Taber, *Quantifying publication impact*, Science 309, 4 (2005).
- [4] *Rating games*, Nature (London) **436**, 889-890 (2005).
- [5] P. Ball, *Index aims for fair ranking of scientists*, Nature (London) **436**,

- 900 (2005).
- [6] Y. Bhattacharjee, *Impact factor*, Science **309**, 1181 (2005).
 - [7] L. Bornmann and H.-D. Daniel, *Does the h-index for ranking of scientists really work?*, Scientometrics 65, 391-392 (2005).
 - [8] W. Glanzel *et. al*, Sientometrics **61**,395 (2004).
 - [9] P.D. Batista, M. G. Campiteli, O. Kinouchi and A. S. Martinez, *Universal behavior of a research productivity index*, physics/0509048.
 - [10] S. Lehmann, B. Lautrup and A. D. Jackson, *Citation networks in high energy physics*, Phys. Rev. E **68**, 026113 (2003).
 - [11] S. Redner, *How popular is your paper? An empirical study of the citation distribution*, Eur. Phys. J. B **4**, 131-134 (1998).
 - [12] C. Tsallis and M. P. de Albuquerque, *Are citations of scientific papers a case of nonextensivity?*, Eur. Phys. J. B **13**, 777-780 (2000).
 - [13] J. Laherrère and D. Sornette, *Stretched exponential distributions in nature and economy: "fat tails" with characteristic scales*, Eur. Phys. J. B **2**, 525-539 (1998).