

Extensions of Egghe's g -index: Improvements of Hirsch h -index

Romeo Meštrović¹, Branislav Dragović^{1*}

¹Maritime Faculty of the University of Montenegro, Kotor, Montenegro

Dobrota, 85330 Kotor, Montenegro; Tel/Fax: +382 303 184

E-mails: romeo@ucg.ac.me; branod1809@gmail.com

*Corresponding Author, branod1809@gmail.com

Keywords: Egghe's g -index, Hirsch h -index, g_d -indices, the order $r = r(g, h)$ of the g -index with respect to the h -index, \bar{g} -index, H -index, Price Awardees' indices.

Abstract

A few new indices to characterize the scientific output of scientists are defined in the paper. These indices are compared with h -index and its alternative indices using some proven assertions. The g_d -indices are introduced as extensions of the g -index to define H -index as an improvement of the h -index. Numerous computational results which are conducted indicate the good behaviour of defined indices to evaluate the scientific impact of scientists. There exist very good approximations between some pairs of all considered indices in the sense that related ratios are often very close to 1.

1. Introduction and notations

To appraise the scientific impact of scientists, institutions and research areas among others, several publication-based indicators are used, such as the size-dependent indicators (total number of citations and number of highly cited papers) and size-independent indicators (average number of citations per paper and proportion of highly cited publications) (Waltman, 2016), as well as citation frequency (life cycle) of papers. Based on the limitations of these indicators, Hirsch (2005) proposed a new indicator called h -index, whilst Egghe (2006a, b, c) defined and studied an improvement of the h -index called the g -index.

The g -index as an improvement of the h -index, is defined as the highest rank such that the cumulative sum of the number of citations received is larger than or equal to the square of this rank. Notice that the g -index comprises information about not only the size of the productive core but also the impact of the papers in the core. Jin et al. (2007) pointed out that the g -index overcomes the problem that the h -index does not include an indicator for the internal changes of the Hirsch core. Yet, it requires drawing a longer list than necessarily for the h -index, hence increasing the precision problem.

Advantages and disadvantages of the h -index are extensively elaborated by Jin et al. (2007) and van Eck and Waltman (2008) among others, and most recently in Britoa and Rodriguez Navarro (2021) and Bihari et al. (2021), whilst the correlations between the h -index and more than a dozen h -index variants was presented by Bihari et al. (2021). For instance, the lack of sensitivity of h highly-cited papers in the h -core (the h most cited papers that are counted for h because they received h or more than h citations) is a frequently noticed disadvantage. Notice that Rousseau (2006) states: "Certainly the h -index does not tell the full story, and, although a more sensitive indicator than the h -index, neither does the g -index. Taken

together, g and h present a concise picture of a scientist's achievements in terms of publications and citations.”

The h -index and its variants are extensively studied in the Journal of Informetrics (experimentally and theoretically). Notice that several generalizations, extensions and variations of the h -index and the g -index were defined, investigated and compared in the last two decades. For a recent review on h -index and its alternative indices, see Bihari et al. (2021). Schreiber (2010) considered twenty Hirsch index variants and other indicators giving more or less preference to highly cited paper. Some Hirsch-type indices were exposed by Egghe (2010). A review of the literature on citation impact indicators was presented by Waltman (2016) and by Egghe (2010).

In this paper we define and study seven new indices which are greater or equal than the h -index. Firstly, for a suitable positive integer $d \geq 2$, the g_d -indices are defined by using the condition that is stronger than that which defines g -index. This definition allows us to define the \bar{g} -, H -, B - and F -indices. Moreover, the C -, D - and K -indices are defined. We prove several inequalities involving these indices and earlier investigated h -, g -, A -, R - and hg -indices. These inequalities and our computational results containing all these indices for 14 Price awardees based on their citation records compiled from Scopus on February 2023, show that there exist better approximations between some pairs of these indices in the sense that related ratios are mainly very close to 1. Our computations are motivated by the fact that Glänzel and Persson (2005) calculated the h -index for the 14 Price awardees who are still active in quantitative studies of science (based on their published journal papers from January 1986 to August 2005 extracted by Web of Science (WoS) database).

To do it, the present paper specifies the notations and related notions as follows:

n - the total number of publications of a scientist in considered database;

cit_j ($j = 1, 2, \dots, n$) – the number of citations received by the j 'th publication ranked in decreased order;

$N_{cit} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_w} cit_j$ - the total number of citations of a scientist in considered database;

$N_{cit}(s) = \sum_{j=1}^s cit_j$ ($s = 1, 2, \dots, N_p$) - the total number of citations of a scientist in considered database up to the rank $s = 1, 2, \dots, n$;

$N_{cit}(h) = \sum_{j=1}^h cit_j$ - the total number of citations of a scientist in considered database into h -core

and

$N_{cit}(g) = \sum_{j=1}^g cit_j$ - the total number citations of a scientist in considered database into g -core.

Here, as always in the sequel, we will suppose that a scientist S has published n publications whose number of citations $cit_1, cit_2, cit_3, \dots, cit_n$ in some database are ranked in decreased order, i.e.,

$$cit_1 \geq cit_2 \geq \dots \geq cit_n \geq 0. \quad (1)$$

The Hirsch or *h-index* (Hirsch, 2005) is defined as the highest rank r such that the first r publications of a scientist received r or greater than r citations in considered database, or equivalently,

$$h = \max\{r : cit_r \geq r\}.$$

The Egghe's *g-index* (Egghe, 2006a,b) is defined as the maximum value of positive integers k ($k = 1, 2, \dots, N$) such that

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k cit_j \geq k. \quad (2)$$

Obviously, $h \leq g$.

Then the g_d -indices with $d = 2, \dots, cit_1$, where cit_1 is a maximal number of citations of a scientist received by the j 'th publication in considered database are introduced in Section 2. The order $r = r(g, h)$ of the g -index with respect to the h -index is defined. It follows that $g \geq g_2 \geq g_3 \geq \dots \geq g_{r+1} \geq h$. The H -index is defined as $H = h\sqrt{r}$ and the \bar{g} -index is defined as the average of the g, g_3, \dots, g_{r+1} indices. Notice that the H -index and the \bar{g} -index can be considered as improvements of the h -index. The preliminary computational results are also given in Section 2.

According to the well-known A -, R - and hg -indices (Jin, 2006, Jin et al., 2007 and Alonso et al., 2010), the four new D -, C - F - and K -indices are defined in Section 3. Some inequalities involving all these indices and the h - and g -indices are proved. Numerous computational results, discussions and remarks concerning comparison of all these indices are conducted.

Finally, concluding remarks are presented in Section 4.

2. The g_d -indices, the \bar{g} -index and the H -index

Numerous computations in several publications involving the h -index and the g -index show that the values of quotients h/g are often values much greater than 1, especially, greater than 1.5, and sometimes greater than 2. In order to refine these quotients, here we define the g_d -indices with $d = 2, 3, \dots, cit_1$ and the H -index which presents an improvement of the h -index. Here, as always in the sequel, we use the notations of Section 1 and the condition (1).

2.1. Definitions and preliminary results

Definition 2.1. Let $x \in (0, cit_1]$ be a real number. Then the real function $G : (0, cit_1] \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is defined as:

$G(x) = \max\{k : k = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that

$$\frac{2}{x} \cdot \frac{\sum_{j=1}^k cit_j}{k} \geq k + 1.$$

Proposition 2.2. *The function $G(x)$ has the following properties:*

- (i) $G(x)$ is a non-increasing function on the interval $(0, cit_1]$;
- (ii) $G(cit_1) = 1 = \min\{G(x) : x \in (0, cit_2]\}$;
- (iii) $\max\{G(x) : x \in (0, c_1] = n$ is attained for each $x \in \left(0, 2\left(\sum_{j=1}^n cit_j\right)/(n(n+1))\right]$

and

- (iv) $G(x)$ is a piecewise constant function on $(0, cit_1]$. Namely, for all $k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ it holds

$$G(x) = k \text{ for each } x \in \left(\left(2\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} cit_j\right)/((k+1)(k+2)), 2\left(\sum_{j=1}^k cit_j\right)/(k(k+1)) \right) \right].$$

Proof. Put

$$A_k = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^k cit_j}{k} \quad (k = 1, 2, \dots, n).$$

Then from the inequalities (1) it follows that

$$cit_{k+1} \leq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^k cit_j}{k} \quad (k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1),$$

which immediately yields

$$A_k \geq A_{k+1} \text{ for all } k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1, \text{ i.e.,}$$

$$A_1 \geq A_2 \geq \dots \geq A_n. \quad (3)$$

Then all the properties (i) - (iv) easily follow from Definition 2.1 and the inequalities (3).

Suppose that $cit_1 \geq 2$. In this paper, we focus our attention to the values $G(x)$, where $x \in [2, cit_1]$ is a positive integer. Accordingly, we give the next discrete version of Definition 2.1, which gives the definition of the g_d -indices.

Definition 2.3. For given positive integer $d \in [2, cit_1]$, define the g_d -indices as the maximal positive integer

$$g_d = \max\{k : k = 1, 2, \dots, n\} \text{ such that}$$

$$\frac{2}{d} \cdot \frac{\sum_{j=1}^k cit_j}{k} \geq k+1. \quad (4)$$

Remarks 2.4. Notice that $g_d = G(d)$, where $G : (0, cit_1] \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is the function defined by Definition 2.3. Notice also that the inequality (4) is equivalent to the condition

$$\sum_{j=1}^k cit_j \geq k \frac{d(k+1)}{2}.$$

Then for each fixed integer $d \geq 2$, the function $s : N \rightarrow N$ defined as $s(n) = d(n+1)/2$ is increasing, convex and $s(1) = d > 1$. Hence, the function s is the gracious function by Definition 4 in Woeginger (2009). Therefore, by Definition 5 in Woeginger (2009), the g_d -indices from Definition 2.1 coincides with the index $G[s]$ associated to the function $s(n) = d(n+1)/2$. Recall also that, if $s(n) = n = id$ is the identity function, then the corresponding index $G[id]$ coincides with the g -index.

Recall that the non-integer analogues of the g -index and the g_d -indices (with the small difference) were defined by van Eck and Waltman (2008, Definitions 3.2 and 3.3; also see Egghe and Rousseau, 2019).

Remark 2.5. If $cit_1 = cit_2 = \dots = cit_h = 1$ and $cit_{h+1} = \dots = cit_n = 0$, then the left hand side of the inequality (4) is $\leq 2/d \leq 1$ which is $< k+1$ for all $k = 1, \dots, cit_1$. Hence, if $cit_1 = 1$, then the g_d -indices do not exist for none $d \geq 2$.

Proposition 2.6. $\{g_d\}_{d=2}^{cit_1}$ is a non-increasing sequence, i.e., we have

$$g_2 \geq g_3 \geq \dots \geq g_{cit_1} = 1 \quad (5)$$

Moreover, we have

$$g - 1 \leq g_2 \leq g. \quad (6)$$

Proof. The inequalities (5) and $g_{cit_1} = 1$ immediately follow from Proposition 2.2 and Definition 2.3.

It remains be proven $g - 1 \leq g_2 \leq g$. Since the condition (4) is stronger than the condition (2) concerning the g -index, it follows that $g_2 \leq g$. By definition of g -index, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^g cit_j \geq g^2. \quad (7)$$

By the condition (1), we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{g-1} cit_j \geq (g-1)cit_g,$$

whence we obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^{g-1} cit_j = \frac{g-1}{g} \sum_{j=1}^{g-1} cit_j + \frac{1}{g} \sum_{j=1}^{g-1} cit_j \geq \frac{g-1}{g} \sum_{j=1}^{g-1} cit_j + \frac{g-1}{g} cit_g = \frac{g-1}{g} \sum_{j=1}^g cit_j \quad (8)$$

Substituting (7) into (8), we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{g-1} cit_j \geq (g-1)g,$$

or equivalently,

$$\frac{1}{g-1} \sum_{j=1}^{g-1} cit_j \geq g.$$

Therefore, $g-1 \leq g_2$. This completes the proof of Proposition 2.6.

Definition 2.7. If only exists the g_2 -index that is $\geq h$ or if there is none g_d -index ($d = 2, 3, \dots$) that is $\geq h$, then the *order* $r = r(g, h)$ of the g -index with respect to the h -index is $r = 1$.

If the g_2 - and g_3 -indices exist, then the *order* $r = r(g, h)$ of the g -index with respect to the h -index is defined as the maximal positive integer r such that $g_{r+1} \geq h$.

Corollary 2.8. If $r = r(g, h) \geq 1$, then

$$g \geq g_2 \geq g_3 \geq \dots \geq g_{r+1} \geq h. \quad (9)$$

Proof. The proof immediately follows from Proposition 2.6 and Definition 2.7.

Definition 2.9. Let $r = r(g, h)$ be the order of the g -index with respect to the h -index. If $r = 1$, then the \bar{g} -index is defined as

$$\bar{g} = g. \quad (10)$$

If $r \geq 2$, then the \bar{g} -index is defined as the average

$$\bar{g} = \frac{g + \sum_{j=3}^{r+1} g_j}{r}. \quad (11)$$

Corollary 2.10. For the \bar{g} -index there holds

$$h \leq \bar{g} \leq g. \quad (12)$$

Proof. The inequalities (12) follow immediately from (11) and the inequalities (9) of Corollary 2.8.

Definition 2.11. If $r = r(g, h)$, then the H -index is defined as

$$H = h\sqrt{r}. \quad (13)$$

Example 2.12. Assume that $cit_1 = cit_2 = \dots = cit_n = h \geq 2$, and hence, $h \geq cit_{h+1} \geq \dots \geq cit_n \geq 0$. Then clearly, the h -index is equal to h . If we suppose that $g \geq h+1$, then put $B = \sum_{i=1}^{g-h} cit_{h+i}$. Notice that $B \leq (g-h)h$, whence it follows that

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^g cit_j}{g} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^h c_{ij} + B}{g} \leq \frac{h^2 + (g-h)h}{g} = h \leq g-1.$$

Consequently, $g = h$. Moreover, we have

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^h cit_j}{h} = h < h+1,$$

and hence $g_2 \leq h-1 = g-1$. Using this and the inequality (6), we obtain $g_2 = g-1$. Therefore, by Definitions 2.7, 2.9 and 2.11, it follows that $r = 1$ and $g = \bar{g} = h = H$.

Remark 2.13. The H -index defined by (13) can be considered as the improvement of the h -index, as it can be seen in the computational results given in Section 3.

Proposition 2.14. *Let $r = r(h, g) \geq 1$ be the order of the g -index with respect to the h -index, and let $\{cit_1, \dots, cit_h, cit_{h+1}, \dots, cit_{h+l}\}$ ($l \geq 0$) be the all citations that belong to the g_{r+1} -core if $r \geq 2$ and to the g -core if $r = 1$. If $r \geq 2$, then*

$$\frac{2N_{cit}(h)}{h(h+1)} - 2 < r \leq \left[\frac{2N_{cit}(h)}{h(h+l+1)} \right] - 1. \quad (14)$$

Furthermore, if $r = 1$, then the above inequalities holds with $(h+l)$ instead of $(h+l+1)$ on the right hand side of (14), where $[x]$ denotes the greatest integer which does not exceed $[x]$.

Proof. Let $r \geq 1$. By Definitions 2.3 and 2.7, we obtain

$$g_{r+2} < h.$$

Hence, by Definitions 2.3 and 2.7, the inequality (4) is not satisfied for $k = h$ and $d = r+2$. Therefore, the converse of the inequality (4) with $k = h$ and $d = r+2$ holds, i.e.,

$$\frac{2}{r+2} \cdot \frac{\sum_{j=1}^h cit_j}{h} < h+1,$$

whence taking $\sum_{j=1}^h cit_j = N_{cit}(h)$, it follows that

$$\frac{2N_{cit}(h)}{h(h+1)} - 2 < r, \quad (15)$$

i.e.,

$$r > \frac{2N_{cit}(h)}{h(h+1)} - 2, \quad (16)$$

which is in fact the left hand side of (14).

Now suppose that $r \geq 2$. Then by Definition 2.3, the inequality (4) is satisfied for $k = h+l$ and $d = r+1$. It follows that

$$\frac{2}{r+1} \cdot \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{h+l} cit_j}{h+l} \geq h+l+1. \quad (17)$$

By the inequalities (3), we have

$$A_h = \frac{N_{cit}(h)}{h} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^h cit_j}{h} \geq A_{h+l} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{h+l} cit_j}{h+l}, \quad (18)$$

which substituting into (17) gives

$$\frac{2}{r+1} \cdot \frac{\sum_{j=1}^h cit_j}{h} \geq h+l+1,$$

whence taking $\sum_{j=1}^h cit_j = N_{cit}(h)$, it follows that

$$r \leq \frac{2N_{cit}(h)}{h(h+l+1)} - 1, \quad (19)$$

i.e.,

$$r \leq \left[\frac{2N_{cit}(h)}{h(h+l+1)} \right] - 1$$

which is in fact the right hand side of (14).

Finally, suppose that $r = 1$. Then by Definition of g -index, the inequality (2) is satisfied for $k = h+l$ and $d = 2$. It follows that

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{h+l} cit_j}{h+l} \geq h+l. \quad (20)$$

Then as in the previous case, substituting the inequality

$$\frac{N_{cit}(h)}{h} \geq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{h+l} cit_j}{h+l}$$

into (20), we obtain

$$\frac{N_{cit}(h)}{h} \geq h+l,$$

whence it follows that

$$r = 1 \leq \frac{N_{cit}(h)}{h(h+l)}$$

and hence,

$$r = 1 \leq \left[\frac{2N_{cit}(h)}{h(h+l)} \right] - 1.$$

This completes the proof of the proposition.

The inequalities (15) and (19) imply the inequality (14), which completes the proof of Proposition 2.14.

As the immediate consequences of Proposition 2.14, we obtain the following five results.

Corollary 2.15. *Let $r \geq 2$. Then under notations of Propositions 2.14, we have*

$$r = \left[\frac{2N_{cit}(h)}{h(h+1)} \right] - 1 = \left[\frac{2A_h}{h+1} \right] - 1 \quad (21)$$

Proof. From the estimates (14) of Proposition 2.14, we obviously have

$$\left[\frac{2N_{cit}(h)}{h(h+1)} \right] - 2 < r \leq \left[\frac{2N_{cit}(h)}{h(h+l+1)} \right] - 1 \leq \left[\frac{2N_{cit}(h)}{h(h+1)} \right] - 1,$$

whence it follows the equality (21).

Corollary 2.16. *Let $r \geq 2$. Then under notations of Propositions 2.14, there holds*

$$\left[\frac{2A_h}{r+2} \right] - 1 < h \leq \left[\frac{2A_h}{r+1} \right] - (l+1),$$

where $A_h = \left(\sum_{j=1}^h cit_j \right) / h$.

If $r = 1$, then

$$2(h+l) \leq 2A_h < 3(h+1).$$

Corollary 2.17. *Let $r \geq 2$. Then*

$$l < \frac{h(h+1)^2}{2N - h(h+1)}.$$

Proof. From the estimates (15) and (19) of Proposition 2.14, we obtain

$$\frac{2N_{cit}(h)}{h(h+1)} - 2 < r \leq \frac{2N_{cit}(h)}{h(h+l+1)} - 1,$$

which implies

$$\frac{2N_{cit}(h)}{h(h+1)} - \frac{2N_{cit}(h)}{h(h+l+1)} < 1.$$

The above inequality immediately yields the inequality from Corollary 2.17.

From Definition 2.11 and Corollary 2.15 it follows the following equality.

Corollary 2.18. *Let $r \geq 2$. Then*

$$H = h \sqrt{\left[\frac{2N_{cit}(h)}{h(h+1)} \right] - 1} = h \sqrt{\left[\frac{2A_h}{h+1} \right] - 1}. \quad (22)$$

Corollary 2.19 directly implies the following estimates.

Corollary 2.19. *Let $r \geq 2$. Then*

$$\sqrt{\frac{2hN_{cit}(h)}{(h+1)} - 2h^2} < H \leq \sqrt{\frac{2hN_{cit}(h)}{(h+1)} - h^2},$$

or equivalently,

$$\sqrt{2h^2 \left(\frac{A_h}{h+1} - 1 \right)} < H \leq \sqrt{h^2 \left(\frac{2A_h}{h+1} - 1 \right)}. \quad (23).$$

2.2. Preliminary computational results

Using Definitions, Propositions, expressions and notations from Subsection 2.1, based on data from Scopus database on 21 February 2023 for 14 Price awardees (see Tables A1 and A2 of Appendix), we obtain the following table.

Table 1. Price awardees data (bases on Scopus, February 2023) - Different indices and related values

Name	Leydesdorff	Glänzel	Moed	Van Raan	Rousseau	Schubert	Martin
g	145	99	86	89	79	85	85
g_3	114	76	68	70	62	68	70
g_4	96	63	57	59	52	58	60
g_5	83	-	50	52	45	51	54
g_6	-	-	-	-	-	46	48
g_7	-	-	-	-	-	42	45
g_8	-	-	-	-	-	-	41
g_9	-	-	-	-	-	-	39
h	79	61	49	48	43	42	38
r	4	3	4	4	4	6	8
$c_h - h$	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
$(c_h - h)/h$	0	0.017	0	0	0	0	0.053
$g_{r+1} - h$	4	2	1	4	2	0	1
$(g_{r+1} - h)/h$	0.051	0.033	0.020	0.083	0.047	0.000	0.026
h/g	0.546	0.616	0.570	0.539	0.544	0.494	0.447
$h\sqrt{r}/g$	1.090	1.067	1.140	1.079	1.089	1.210	1.264
$h\sqrt{r-1}/g$	0.944	0.871	0.986	0.934	0.943	1.1050	1.183
$H = h\sqrt{r}$	158	105.652	98	96	86	102.879	107.480
\bar{g}	88.750	79.333	65.250	67.500	59.500	58.333	55.250
N_{cit}	8053	11766	7606	8308	8053	7587	7598
$N_{cit}(h)$	17360	8049	6351	6833	5203	6359	7048
$N_{cit}(h)/h$	219.747	131.95	129.612	142.235	121	151.140	185.48
$N_{cit}(g)$	21225	9810	7397	8042	6300	7348	7597
$N_{cit}(g)/g$	146.379	99.691	86.01	90.360	79.747	86.447	89.376

Table 1 – Continued. Price awardees data (bases on Scopus, February 2023) - Different indices and related values

Name	Narin	Garfield	Braun	Small	Egghe	Ingwersen	White
g	68	106	66	57	69	59	28
g_3	68	86	51	57	54	46	28
g_4	59	74	42	57	46	39	28
g_5	53	65	37	54	41	34	28
g_6	48	60	-	50	36	31	27
g_7	44	55	-	46	33	28	25
g_8	42	51	-	43	31	-	23
g_9	38	48	-	40	-	-	22
g_{10}	-	45	-	38	-	-	21
g_{11}	-	43	-	36	-	-	20
g_{12}	-	41	-	34	-	-	-
g_{13}	-	39	-	-	-	-	-
g_{14}	-	38	-	-	-	-	-
h	38	37	37	34	30	27	19
r	8	13	4	11	7	6	10
$c_h - h$	0	2	0	0	2	1	1
$(c_h - h)/h$	0	0.054	0	0	0.067	0.037	0.053
$g_{r+1} - h$	0	1	0	0	1	1	1
$(g_{r+1} - h)/h$	0	0.027	0	0	0.033	0.037	0.053
h/g	0.559	0.350	0.561	0.596	0.435	0.545	0.679
$h\sqrt{r}/g$	1.581	1.259	1.121	1.978	1.150	1.121	2.251
$h\sqrt{r-1}/g$	1.479	1.209	0.971	1.886	1.065	1.023	2.146
$H = h_r = h\sqrt{r}$	107.480	133.405	74	112.765	79.373	66.136	63.017
\bar{g}	52.500	57.769	49	46.545	44.286	39.500	25.000
N_{cit}	7209	11515	5680	7693	5640	3606	2399
$N_{cit}(h)$	6823	10509	3566	7471	3995	2952	2332
$N_{cit}(h)/h$	179.55	284.03	96.378	219.735	133.167	109.333	122.74
$N_{cit}(g)$	7209	11359	4373	7690	4807	3508	2399
$N_{cit}(g)/g$	106.015	107.160	66.258	134.912	69.667	59.458	85.68

The data from Table 1 will be used in the next section to obtain numerous computational results.

**3. The comparisons of the h -, g -, A - and the R -indices
with new \bar{g} -, H - and D -indices**

Using the notations from Sections 1 and 2, Jin's A -index (the name was suggested by Rousseau (2006)), introduced by Jin (Jin 2006) is defined as the average number of citations received by the publications into h -core, i.e.,

$$A = \frac{1}{h} \sum_{j=1}^h cit_j,$$

which is under our notation equal to $N_{cit}(h)/h$.

Another attempt to improve the insensitivity of the h -index to the number of citations to highly cited papers is the R -index, introduced in Jin et al. (2007, p.857). The R -index as defined as

$$R = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^h cit_j},$$

where publications, as usual, are ranked in decreasing order of the number of received citations, whereby cit_j is the number of citations to the j 'th publication and where h is the h -index. So, as the h -index, also this measure takes into account the actual cit_j -values in the h -core. It is an improvement of the Jin's A -index. Note that

$$R = \sqrt{hA} = \sqrt{N_{cit}(h)}.$$

It is easy to show that (see Proposition 1 and Corollary in Jin et al. (2007))

$$h \leq g \leq A. \tag{24}$$

Moreover, from $R = \sqrt{hA}$ and $A \geq h$ by Corollary in Jin et al. (2007, p. 657) it follows that

$$h \leq R. \tag{25}$$

Here we also introduce the D -index defined as

$$D = \sqrt{2hA - h^2} = \sqrt{2R^2 - h^2}.$$

Notice that

$$D = \sqrt{2 \sum_{j=1}^h cit_j - h^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^h cit_j + \sum_{j=1}^h (cit_j - h)} \geq R. \tag{26}$$

From the inequality $(A - h)^2 \geq 0$ it follows immediately that

$$D \leq A. \tag{27}$$

By (25), (26) and (27) we have the following result.

Proposition 3.1. *The inequalities*

$$h \leq R \leq D \leq A. \quad (28)$$

holds.

Recall that in Section 2 (Definitions 2.9 and 2.11) we defined the \bar{g} -index and the H -index as:

$$\bar{g} = g \quad \text{if } r = 1,$$

$$\bar{g} = \frac{g + \sum_{j=3}^{r+1} g_j}{r} \quad \text{if } r \geq 2.$$

and

$$H = h\sqrt{r},$$

where $r = r(g, h)$ is the order of the g -index with respect to the h -index.

By Corollary 2.10, $h \leq \bar{g} \leq g$, which together with the inequality (24) yields the following result.

Proposition 3.2. *The inequalities*

$$h \leq \bar{g} \leq g \leq A \quad (29)$$

holds.

Proposition 3.3. *The inequalities*

$$H \leq D \leq A \quad (30)$$

holds.

Proof. By (27), we have $D \leq A$. Note that the inequality $H \leq D$ is equivalent to the following one:

$$h \leq \frac{2A}{r+1}. \quad (31)$$

If $r = 1$, the inequality (31) becomes $h \leq A$, which is true. If $r \geq 2$ and $l = g_{r+1} - h$, then by Corollary 2.16,

$$h \leq \frac{2A}{r+1} - (l+1) \leq \frac{2A}{r+1} - 1 < \frac{2A}{r+1}.$$

This completes the proof.

Remarks 3.4. Notice that the equality in the inequality (29) and thus in the inequalities (28) holds in Example 2.12 with $cit_1 = cit_2 = \dots = cit_h = h$ and $cit_{h+1} = \dots = cit_n = 0$.

If $r \geq 2$, then from the proof of Proposition 3.3, we get

$$h \leq \frac{2A}{r+1} - 1.$$

From data of Table 1 and the above expressions we immediately obtain the following table.

Table 2. Price awardees data (bases on Scopus, February 2023) - The h -, \bar{g} -, R -, g -, H -, D - and A -indices

Name	Leydesdorf	Glänzel	Moed	Van Raan	Rousseau	Schubert	Martin
h	79	61	49	48	43	42	38
\bar{g}	88.750	79.333	65.250	67.500	59.500	58.333	55.250
R	131.757	89.716	79.693	82.662	72.132	79.743	83.952
g	145	99	86	89	79	85	85
H	158	105.652	98	96	86	102.879	107.480
D	168.757	111.252	101.494	106.593	92.504	104.555	112.481
A	219.747	131.950	129.612	142.235	121	151.140	185.480

Table 2 – Continued. Price awardees data (bases on Scopus, February 2023) - The h -, \bar{g} -, R -, g -, H -, D - and A -indices

Name	Narin	Garfield	Braun	Small	Egghe	Ingwersen	White
h	38	37	37	34	30	27	19
\bar{g}	52.500	57.769	49	46.545	44.286	39.500	25.000
R	82.6015	102.513	59.716	86.435	63.206	54.332	48.291
g	68	106	66	57	69	59	28
H	107.480	133.405	74	112.765	79.373	66.136	63.017
D	110.463	140.175	75.914	117.414	84.202	71.938	65.597
A	179.550	284.030	96.378	219.735	133.167	109.330	122.740

From Table 2 we see that for 11 scientists there holds

$$h < \bar{g} < R < g < H < D < A,$$

while for other three scientists (Narin, Small and White) we have

$$h < \bar{g} < R < H < D < A$$

and for these three scientists we have.

$$R > g.$$

Notice that the order $r = r(g, h)$ of the g -index with respect to the h -index of Narin, Small and White are relatively big numbers; namely, equals 8, 11 and 10, respectively (see Table 1).

Remarks 3.5. Table 2 and many additional computations concerning numerous scientists assumed from different databases show that $H \geq g$. This inequality is equivalent to the following one:

$$h\sqrt{r} \geq g. \quad (32)$$

However, let $cit_1 = cit_2 = 4$, $cit_3 = 1$ and $cit_i = 0$ for $i > 3$. Then $h = 2$, $g = 3$, $g_2 = 2$ and $g_3 = 1 < h$. Thus, $r = 1$, $\bar{g} = 3$ and $H = h = 2 < g$. This shows that the inequality (32) is not necessarily satisfied for $r = 1$. Assume now that $cit_1 = cit_2 = 5$, $cit_3 = 2$ and $cit_i = 0$ for $i > 3$. Then $h = 2$, $g = 3$, $g_2 = 3$, $g_3 = 2$ and $g_4 = 1 < h$. Thus, $r = 2$, $\bar{g} = 2.5$ and $H = h\sqrt{r} = 2\sqrt{2} < 3 = g$. This shows that the inequality (32) is not necessarily satisfied for $r = 2$. Similarly, we can construct an example with arbitrary integer $r \geq 3$ such that the converse of the inequality (32) is true.

From Table 2 we obtain the following table.

Table 3. Price awardees data (bases on Scopus, February 2023) - The ratios \bar{g}/h , R/\bar{g} , g/R , H/g , D/H , A/D , A/h and $2A/((r+1)h)$ based on data from Table 2

Name	Leydesdorf	Glänzel	Moed	Van Raan	Rousseau	Schubert	Martin
\bar{g}/h	1.123	1.301	1.331	1.406	1.383	1.389	1.454
R/\bar{g}	1.485	1.131	1.221	1.225	1.212	1.367	1.519
g/R	1.101	1.103	1.079	1.077	1.095	1.066	1.012
H/g	1.090	1.067	1.140	1.079	1.090	1.210	1.264
D/H	1.068	1.053	1.036	1.103	1.076	1.016	1.047
A/D	1.302	1.186	1.271	1.334	1.308	1.446	1.649
A/h	2.782	2.163	2.645	2.963	2.813	3.599	4.881
$2A/((r+1)h)$	1.113	1.082	1.058	1.185	1.126	1.028	1.085

Table 3 – Continued. Price awardees data (bases on Scopus, February 2023) - The ratios \bar{g}/h , R/\bar{g} , g/R , H/g , D/H , A/D , A/h and $2A/((r+1)h)$ based on data from Table 2

Name	Narin	Garfield	Braun	Small	Egghe	Ingwersen	White
\bar{g}/h	1.382	1.561	1.324	1.552	1.476	1.463	1.316
R/\bar{g}	1.573	1.775	1.219	1.857	1.427	1.375	0.580
g/R	0.823	1.034	1.105	0.659	1.092	1.086	0.580
H/g	1.581	1.259	1.212	1.978	1.150	1.121	2.251
D/H	1.028	1.051	1.026	1.041	1.061	1.088	1.041
A/D	1.625	2.026	1.267	1.871	1.582	1.520	1.871
A/h	9.450	15.352	5.206	12.926	8.878	8.100	12.920
$2A/((r+1)h)$	1.050	1.097	1.042	1.077	1.110	1.157	1.175

Remarks 3.6. From Table 3 we see the ratios $H/g = h\sqrt{r}/g$ of White, Small and Narin are significantly greater than 1, namely, they are equal to 2.251, 1.978 and 1.581, respectively. Notice that the orders $r = r(g, h)$ of the g -index with respect to the h -index of White, Small and Narin are relatively big numbers; namely, equals 10, 11 and 8, respectively (see Table 1). For other 11 scientists, we have

$1 < H/g < 1.3$. Furthermore, from Table 3 we also see that the ratios A/h of these three scientists are relatively big numbers, namely, they are equal to 9.450, 12.926 and 12.920, respectively.

From Table 2 we can rank Price awardees with respect to their h -, \bar{g} -, R -, g -, H -, D - and A -indices, as it is given in Table 4.

Table 4. Price awardees ranked with respect to the h -, \bar{g} -, R -, g -, H -, D - and A -indices

Name	Leydesdorf	Glänzel	Moed	Van Raan	Rousseau	Schubert	Martin
h	1	2	3	4	5	6	7/8
\bar{g}	1	2	4	3	5	6	8
R	1	3	8	6	10	9	5
g	1	3	5	4	8	6/7	6/7
H	1	6	8	9	10	7	4/5
D	1	5	9	7	10	8	4
A	2	9	10	7	13	6	4

Table 4 – Continued. Price awardees ranked with respect to the h -, \bar{g} -, R -, g -, H -, D - and A -indices

Name	Narin	Garfield	Braun	Small	Egghe	Ingwersen	White
h	7/8	9/10	9/10	11	12	13	14
\bar{g}	9	7	10	11	12	13	14
R	7	2	12	4	11	13	14
g	10	2	11	13	9	12	14
H	4/5	2	12	3	11	13	14
D	6	2	12	3	11	13	14
A	5	1	14	3	8	11	12

From Table 4 we see that considered scientists are ranked with respect to the \bar{g} -index very close as with respect to the h -index. Namely, five scientists have the same rank with respect to these two indices. Martin and Narin have the same h -index, and they are ranked 7th - 8th place with respect to the h -index, and 8th and 9th place with respect to the g -index, respectively. Moreover, Garfield and Braun have the same h -index, and they are ranked 9th - 10th place with respect to the h -index, and 7th and 10th place with respect to the g -index, respectively. Moed and Van Raan are ranked 3th and 4th place with respect to the h -index, and 4th and 3th place with respect to the g -index, respectively.

Let α and β be the ratios given as

$$\alpha = \frac{H}{g} = \frac{h\sqrt{r}}{g},$$

$$\beta = \frac{D}{g} = \frac{\sqrt{2hA - h^2}}{g} = \frac{\sqrt{2R^2 - h^2}}{g}.$$

Then we have

$$\frac{D}{H} = \frac{\beta}{\alpha} = \frac{\sqrt{2hA - h^2}}{h\sqrt{r}} = \frac{\sqrt{2R^2 - h^2}}{h\sqrt{r}} = \sqrt{\frac{2A - h}{hr}}.$$

We also define the difference δ as

$$\delta = \left\lceil \frac{2A}{h} \right\rceil - (r+1) = \left\lceil \frac{2N_{cit}(h)}{h^2} \right\rceil - (r+1)$$

and

$$l = g_{r+1} - h.$$

From Tables 1 and 2, we immediately obtain the following table.

Table 5. Price awardees - The values $\beta, r+1, \delta$ and l

Name	Leydesdorff	Glänzel	Moed	Van Raan	Rousseau	Schubert	Martin
$\beta = D/g$	1.164	1.124	1.180	1.198	1.171	1.230	1.323
$r+1$	5	4	5	5	5	7	9
$\delta = \lceil 2A/h \rceil - (r+1)$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$l = g_{r+1} - h$	4	2	1	4	2	1	1

Table 5 – Continued. Price awardees - The values $\beta, r+1, \delta$ and l

Name	Narin	Garfield	Braun	Small	Egghe	Ingwersen	White
$\beta = D/g$	1.624	1.322	1.163	2.060	1.222	1.219	2.339
$r+1$	9	14	5	12	8	7	11
$\delta = \lceil 2A/h \rceil - (r+1)$	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
$l = g_{r+1} - h$	0	1	0	0	1	1	1

Remarks 3.7. From Tables 1 and 5 we see that for all 14 scientists, we have

$$h < \frac{2A}{r+1} < 1.2h.$$

From Table 5 we see that $r = \lceil 2A/h \rceil - 1$ for 12 scientists, while $r = \lceil 2A/h \rceil - 2$ for two scientists (Garfield and White).

Remarks 3.8. Notice that by (21) of Corollary 2.15, we have

$$r = \left\lceil \frac{2A}{h+1} \right\rceil \quad (33)$$

Finally, motivated by the fact that the R -index ($R = \sqrt{hA}$) is an improvement of the h -index, we believe that it can be of interest to investigate the following indices:

$$B =: \sqrt{hg}, C =: \sqrt{hR} = \sqrt[4]{h^3A}, E =: \sqrt{hg}, F =: \sqrt{hH} = h^{\frac{1}{4}}r \text{ and } K =: \sqrt{hD} = h\sqrt{\frac{2A}{h}-1}. \quad (34)$$

Alonso et al. (2010) presented a new index, called hg -index (here named the E -index) defined as

$$E = \sqrt{hg}.$$

Then obviously, $h \leq E \leq g$, which together with the inequality (24) yields

$$h \leq E \leq g \leq A.$$

From the above inequality, Propositions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 we obtain the following inequalities, respectively.

Proposition 3.9. *The following inequalities are satisfied:*

$$h \leq C \leq K \leq A, \quad (35)$$

$$h \leq B \leq E \leq g \leq A, \quad (36)$$

and

$$F \leq K \leq A. \quad (37)$$

From Table 2 and the expressions given by (34), we get the following table.

Table 6. Price awardees - The h -, B -, C -, E -, F - and K -indices

Name	Leydesdorf	Glänzel	Moed	Van Raan	Rousseau	Schubert	Martin
h	79	61	49	48	43	42	38
B	83.734	69.565	56.544	56.921	50.582	49.497	45.820
C	102.024	73.979	62.490	62.990	55.693	57.872	56.482
E	107.028	77.711	64.915	65.361	58.284	59.750	56.833
F	111.723	80.279	69.297	67.882	60.811	65.734	63.908
K	115.463	82.379	70.521	71.530	63.069	66.267	65.378

Table 6 - Continued. Price awardees - The h -, B -, C -, E -, F - and K -indices

Name	Narin	Garfield	Braun	Small	Egghe	Ingwersen	White
h	38	37	37	34	30	27	19
B	44.665	46.233	42.579	39.781	36.450	32.657	21.795
C	56.026	61.587	47.005	54.211	43.545	38.301	30.291
E	50.833	62.626	49.417	44.023	45.497	39.912	23.065
F	63.908	70.257	52.326	61.919	48.797	42.257	34.602
K	64.789	72.017	52.998	63.183	50.260	44.072	35.304

Using the equalities given by (34) and data from Table 6, we obtain the following table.

Table 7. Price awardees - The ratios B/h , C/B , E/C , F/E and K/F

Name	Leydesdorf	Glänzel	Moed	Van Raan	Rousseau	Schubert	Martin
B/h	1.060	1.140	1.110	1.186	1.176	1.179	1.206
C/B	1.218	1.063	1.106	1.107	1.101	1.169	1.233
E/C	1.049	1.050	1.039	1.038	1.047	1.032	1.007
F/E	1.044	1.033	1.068	1.040	1.043	1.100	1.124
K/F	1.033	1.026	1.018	1.0537	1.037	1.008	1.023

Table 7. – Continued. Price awardees - The ratios B/h , C/B , E/C , F/E and K/F

Name	Narin	Garfield	Braun	Small	Egghe	Ingwersen	White
B/h	1.223	1.250	1.151	1.170	1.215	1.210	1.147
C/B	1.254	1.332	1.104	1.363	1.195	1.173	1.3401.
E/C	0.907	1.017	1.051	0.812	1.045	1.042	0.761
F/E	1.257	1.122	1.059	1.407	1.073	1.059	1.500
K/F	1.014	1.025	1.013	1.020	1.030	1.043	1.020

From Table 6 we see that for 11 scientists the following chain of inequalities is satisfied:

$$h < B < C < E < F < K,$$

while for other three scientists (Narin, Small and White) we have

$$h < B < F < K,$$

and for these three scientists we have.

$$C > E.$$

Furthermore, from Table 7 we also see that the values K/F of 14 scientists are very close to 0 (namely, less than 1.06). The same estimate is true for the quotients E/C for eleven scientists (except Narin, Small and White).

By using data from Table 6, we can rank all 14 scientists with respect to their B -, C -, E -, F - and K -indices, as it was given in Table 8.

Table 8. Price awardees ranked with respect to the h -, B -, C -, E -, F - and K -indices

Name	Leydesdorf	Glänzel	Moed	Van Raan	Rousseau	Schubert	Martin
h	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B	1	2	4	3	5	6	8
C	1	2	4	3	9	6	7
E	1	2	4	3	7	6	8
F	1	2	4	5	10	6	7/8
K	1	2	5	4	10	6	7

Table 8 – Continued. Price awardees ranked with respect to the h -, B -, C -, E -, F - and K -indices

Name	Narin	Garfield	Braun	Small	Egghe	Ingwersen	White
h	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
B	9	7	10	11	12	13	14
C	8	5	11	10	12	13	14
E	9	5	10	12	11	13	14
F	7/8	3	11	9	12	13	14
K	8	3	11	9	12	13	14

From Table 8 we see that considered scientists are ranked with respect to the B -index ($B = \sqrt{hg}$) very close as with respect to the h -index. The pairs of the rank of h -index and B -index of Moed, Van Raan, Martin, Narin and Garfield are (3, 4), (4, 3), (7, 8), (8, 9) and (9, 7), respectively.

Namely, nine scientists have the same rank with respect to these two indices. Martin and Narin have the same h -index, and they are ranked 7th - 8th place with respect to the h -index, and 8th and 9th place with respect to the g -index, respectively. Moreover, Garfield and Braun have the same h -index, and they are ranked 9th - 10th place with respect to the h -index, and 7th and 10th place with respect to the g -index, respectively. Moed and Van Raan are ranked 3th and 4th place with respect to the h -index, and 4th and 3th place with respect to the g -index, respectively.

Remarks 3.10. Table from Appendix A in Jin et al. (2007) gives the h -, g - and the R -indices of all 14 Price awardees, based on WoS, January 2006. Using this and the expression (21) of Corollary 2.15 given in the form

$$r = \left[\frac{2R^2}{h(h+1)} \right] - 1,$$

we obtain the following table.

Table 9. Price awardees - The h -, g -, R - and H -indices and the values r , H/g and H/R

Name	Leydesdorf	Glänzel	Moed	Van Raan	Rousseau	Schubert	Martin
h	13	18	18	19	13	18	16
g	19	27	27	27	15	30	27
h/g	0.684	0.667	0.667	0.704	0.867	0.600	0.593
R	17.52	37.85	27.40	24.73	14.20	25.53	25.17
r	2	2	3	2	1	2	3
$H = h\sqrt{r}$	18.384	47.624	31.177	26.870	13	25.456	27.713
H/g	0.968	1.764	1.155	0.995	0.867	0.849	1.026
H/R	1.049	1.258	1.138	1.087	0.915	0.997	1.101

Table 9 – Continued. Price awardees - The h -, g -, R - and H -indices and the values r , H/g and H/R

Name	Narin	Garfield	Braun	Small	Egghe	Ingwersen	White
h	27	27	25	18	13	13	12
g	40	59	38	39	19	26	25
h/g	0.675	0.458	0.658	0.462	0.684	0.500	0.480
R	37.51	55.21	34.17	24.37	24.85	17.77	23.52
r	2	7	2	2	5	2	6
$H = h\sqrt{r}$	38.184	71.435	35.355	24.456	29.069	18.385	29.394
H/g	0.955	1.211	0.930	0.653	1.530	0.707	1.176
H/R	1.018	1.294	1.035	1.0035	1.170	1.035	1.250

From Table 9 we see that the values H/g are less than 1 for eight Price awardees, while these values are close to 1 for five Price awardees (Leydesdorf, Van Raan, Martin, Narin and Braun, for which $|H/g - 1| \leq 0.07$). Furthermore, the values H/R are close to 1 for seven Price awardees (namely, we see $0 < H/g - 1 < 0.05$ for these seven Price awardees).

4. Conclusions

This paper presents new indices to characterize the scientific output of researchers. The g_d -indices ($d = 2, 3, \dots, cit_1$) were introduced as extensions of the Egghe's g -index whose definition allows defining the order $r = r(g, h)$ ($r = 1, 2, \dots$) of the g -index with respect to the Hirsch h -index. Further the \bar{g} -index is defined as $\bar{g} = g$ if $r = 1$, and \bar{g} is equal to the average of the g, g_3, \dots, g_{r+1} -indices if $r \geq 2$, and H -index as $H = h\sqrt{r}$. The definition of the order $r = r(g, h)$ suggests the fact that H -index and the \bar{g} -index significantly improve the h -index of scientists with highly cited publications which are not appropriately appreciated in the Hirsch h -index. This is confirmed by computational results concerning the values of these indices and related ratios for Price awardees. Notice that for all considered Price awardees it holds $h < \bar{g} < g < H < A$.

The D -, B -, C -, K -, and F -index are defined as the expressions involving the previous mentioned indices. We prove several inequalities involving these indices and earlier investigated the h -, g -, A - and R - and hg -indices. These inequalities and our computational results containing all these indices for 14 Price awardees, confirm very good approximations between some pairs of these indices. Finally, notice that certain indices defined in this paper eliminate some of the disadvantages of the h -index and g -index.

References

- Alonso, S., Cabrerizo, F.J, Herrera-Viedma, E. and Herrera, F. (2010). *hg-index: A New Index to Characterize the Scientific Output of Researchers Based on the h - and g -indices*, *Scientometrics*, 82, 391–400.
- Bihari, A., Tripathi, S. and Deepak, A. (2021). A review on h -index and its alternative indices, *Journal of Information Science*, 1–42, DOI: 10.1177/01655515211014478
- Britoa, R. and Rodriguez Navarro, A. (2021). The inconsistency of h -index: A mathematical analysis, *Journal of Informetrics*, 15(1), 101–106.
- Egghe, L. (2006a). An improvement of the h -index: The g -index. *International Society for Scientometrics and Informetrics (ISSI newsletter)*, 2(1), 8–9.
- Egghe, L. (2006b). How to improve the h -index: Letter. *The Scientist*, 20(3).
- Egghe, L. (2006c). Theory and practice of the g -index. *Scientometrics*, 69(1), 131–152.
- Egghe, L. (2010). The Hirsch index and related impact measures, *Information Science and Technology*, 44(1), 65–114.
- Egghe, L. and Rousseau, R. (2019). Solution by step functions of a minimum problem in $L^2[0,T]$, using generalized h - and g -indices, *Journal of Informetrics*, 13(3), 785–792.
- Glänzel, W. and Persson, O. (2005). H -index for Price medalist. *ISSI Newsletter*, 1(4), 15–18
- Hirsch, J. (2005). An index to quantify an individual’s scientific research output. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America – PNAS*, 102, 16569–16572.
- Jin, B.-H. (2007). The AR -index: Complementing the h -index, *ISSI Newsletter*, 3(1), p. 6.
- Jin, B.-H., Liang, L.-M., Rousseau, R. and Egghe, L. (2007). The R - and AR -indices: Complementing the h -index, *Chinese Science Bulletin*, 52(6), 855–863.
- Rousseau, R. (2006). New developments related to the Hirsch index, *Science Focus*, 1(4), 23–25 (in Chinese). English version available at: E-LIS: code 6376, <http://www.eprints.rclis.org/archive/00006376/>.
- Schreiber, M. (2010). Twenty Hirsch index variants and other indicators giving more or less preference to highly cited papers, *Annalen der Physik* (Berlin), 522(8), 536–554.
- van Eck, N. J. and Waltman, L. (2008). Generalizing the h - and g -indices. *Journal of Informetrics*, 2(4), 263–271.
- Waltman, L. (2016). A review of the literature on citation impact indicators. *Journal of Informetrics*, 10(2), 365–391.
- Woeginger J. G. (2009). Generalizations of Egghe’s g -Index, *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 60(6), 1267–1273.

(The Appendix follows overleaf)

Appendix

This Appendix contains Price awardees data (see more in Glänzel and Persson, 2005) extracted from Scopus in Tables A1 and A2, their citation count per each paper and h -, g - and g_d -indices.

Table A1. Price awardees (see more in Glänzel and Persson, 2005) and their h -index and g -indices (bases on Scopus, 21st February 2023 and Jin et al. 2007)

Scientist	No. of papers	No. of citations	No. of citations per paper	h -index		g -index	
				January 2006	21 February 2023	January 2006	21 February 2023
				WoS	Scopus	WoS	Scopus
Eugene Garfield	256	11515	45	27	37	59	106
Francis Narin	68	7209	106	27	38	40	68
Tibor Braun	260	5680	22	25	37	38	66
Anthony Van Raan	136	8308	61	19	48	27	89
Wolfgang Glänzel	293	11766	40	18	61	27	99
Henk Moed	147	7606	52	18	49	27	86
Andras Schubert	164	7587	46	18	41	30	85
Henry Small	62	7693	124	18	34	39	57
Ben Martin	96	7598	79	16	38	27	85
Leo Egghe	231	5640	24	13	30	19	69
Peter Ingwersen	100	3606	36	13	27	26	59
Loet Leydesdorff	432	25005	58	13	79	19	145
Ronald Rousseau	330	8053	24	13	43	15	79
Howard White	29	2399	83	12	19	25	28

Recall that in Table A2 the citations that belong to the bounds of the h -, g - and g_d -indices of 14 Price awardees are marked in bold. Also, recall that by Table 1, for Schubert $h = g_{r+1} = g_7 = 42$, for Narin $h = g_{r+1} = g_9 = 38$, for Braun $h = g_{r+1} = g_5 = 37$ and for Small $h = g_{r+1} = g_{12} = 34$ Notice also that by Table 1, for Narin $g = g_3 = 68$ (which is actually equal to the number of his publications), for Small $g = g_3 = g_4 = 57$ and for White $g = g_3 = g_4 = g_5 = 28$.

Table A2. Price awardees data and their h -, g - and g_d -indices (bases on Scopus, 21st February 2023)

	Price awardees													White
	Leyde- sdorff	Glänzel	Moed	Van Raan	Rousseau	Schubert	Martin	Narin	Garfield	Braun	Small	Egghe	Ingwe- Rsen	
1	3964	534	417	522	1050	1858	1828	803	1888	449	2846	1455	482	1029
2	647	449	417	455	484	449	728	780	1711	362	592	478	414	213
3	544	417	380	381	478	362	411	519	1635	255	540	242	348	178
4	479	364	350	350	265	273	391	481	597	158	410	206	232	148
5	424	273	303	303	242	255	371	443	589	151	242	153	166	124
6	422	255	290	290	175	211	362	354	430	147	197	124	156	123
7	410	249	288	284	153	159	282	339	264	138	193	110	155	104
8	401	220	248	283	126	158	244	306	255	135	190	107	133	72
9	376	211	197	276	118	155	223	283	252	127	186	88	113	54
10	352	201	183	206	111	151	196	226	238	120	157	81	70	50
11	352	188	182	172	110	147	179	193	238	119	154	71	57	35
12	301	163	174	166	97	133	131	183	178	96	151	70	56	32
13	291	159	166	157	96	127	128	159	155	77	144	70	49	29
14	266	155	152	152	88	120	122	151	154	75	129	68	46	28
15	252	147	146	150	87	119	114	138	153	73	113	65	45	25
16	242	145	122	146	75	105	101	121	151	69	112	50	42	24
17	241	141	118	142	74	98	77	114	139	67	111	48	42	23
18	232	135	118	136	72	92	73	94	132	61	102	47	41	21
19	225	133	117	130	70	89	72	87	114	59	98	46	39	20
20	221	127	103	111	67	75	69	81	113	57	90	45	39	19
21	184	126	95	110	66	73	68	76	111	55	81	42	38	17
22	179	126	92	103	64	73	66	73	91	55	79	41	35	15
23	171	121	88	98	63	72	65	73	88	52	71	40	35	5
24	166	111	80	94	61	71	64	68	83	52	57	40	33	5
25	165	109	76	92	58	70	63	67	74	51	51	39	29	2
26	157	108	75	86	56	69	58	61	73	47	49	35	29	2
27	154	96	75	82	56	69	57	61	69	46	47	34	28	1
28	147	94	73	81	55	64	55	55	65	45	44	34	27	1
29	147	92	71	81	51	63	50	54	64	45	43	34	27	0
30	147	89	70	77	49	62	48	50	63	45	41	32	26	0
31	141	89	69	76	48	62	48	43	63	43	40	30	25	
32	138	89	69	75	48	57	47	43	53	42	39	29	24	
33	135	85	63	73	47	53	46	43	51	40	38	29	24	
34	133	85	62	72	46	52	46	42	49	40	34	28	24	
35	133	84	61	72	45	47	45	41	45	39	21	27	23	
36	129	84	60	68	45	46	40	40	42	37	21	26	23	
37	129	83	60	65	45	46	40	40	39	37	20	25	23	
38	127	80	58	63	45	45	40	38	30	36	19	24	22	
39	127	80	57	62	44	45	32	37	28	34	18	24	22	
40	126	78	57	60	44	43	32	34	27	33	17	24	22	
41	125	76	56	59	43	41	31	32	27	33	17	24	18	
42	125	76	55	59	43	42	28	27	25	33	15	24	17	
43	125	75	53	59	43	40	24	24	23	32	14	23	16	
44	125	75	53	55	42	37	23	21	22	31	10	22	16	
45	124	75	52	52	42	36	23	21	22	31	9	22	15	
46	123	74	52	51	42	36	23	20	21	30	9	22	15	
47	122	73	50	48	41	36	22	18	21	29	6	22	14	
48	122	73	49	48	40	33	21	18	21	28	4	22	14	
49	118	73	49	47	39	32	21	17	21	28	4	20	13	
50	108	72	47	45	39	31	21	14	21	27	4	20	13	
51	106	72	45	41	39	31	20	12	20	27	4	20	13	
52	102	71	44	41	37	27	20	12	20	27	2	19	12	
53	100	71	43	39	37	27	20	11	20	27	1	19	12	
54	98	70	43	39	33	27	17	11	19	26	1	18	11	
55	97	69	41	39	32	27	16	11	18	26	1	18	10	
56	94	66	41	38	32	26	14	9	18	26	1	18	10	
57	94	64	39	38	30	26	11	7	17	25	1	18	9	
58	93	63	39	37	30	25	9	6	17	25		18	8	
59	93	62	36	37	29	23	9	6	17	25		17	8	
60	92	62	35	36	29	23	9	6	16	25		17	8	
61	91	62	34	36	28	23	8	5	16	25		17	8	

Table A2 – Continued. Price awardees data and their h -, g - and g_d -indices (bases on Scopus, 21st February 2023)

Price awardees														
	Leyde- sdorff	Glänzel	Moed	Van Raan	Rousseau	Schubert	Martin	Narin	Garfield	Braun	Small	Egghe	Ingwe- Rsen	White
62	90	59	33	35	28	23	7	4	15	24		17	7	
63	89	59	32	34	28	22	7	2	15	24		16	7	
64	87	57	30	32	27	22	7	1	14	24		16	6	
65	87	57	29	31	27	21	7	0	14	23		16	5	
66	87	56	29	31	27	20	6	0	14	23		16	5	
67	87	55	28	30	27	19	6	0	14	23		16	4	
68	86	54	27	29	27	17	5	0	14	22		15	4	
69	83	54	27	29	26	17	5		13	22		14	4	
70	83	53	27	28	26	16	5		13	21		14	4	
71	83	52	25	28	25	15	5		12	21		14	4	
72	82	52	25	28	24	15	4		12	21		14	3	
73	82	52	23	27	24	15	4		12	21		14	3	
74	82	52	23	25	24	15	4		12	20		14	3	
75	80	51	22	24	24	14	4		12	19		14	3	
76	80	49	22	24	23	14	4		12	19		13	3	
77	80	48	22	24	23	14	3		10	19		13	2	
78	79	48	19	23	23	14	3		10	18		13	2	
79	79	48	18	22	23	13	2		10	18		13	2	
80	78	47	16	21	23	13	2		9	17		12	2	
81	78	46	16	21	23	13	1		9	17		12	1	
82	77	45	15	20	23	13	1		9	16		12	1	
83	77	45	14	20	22	13	1		9	16		11	1	
84	77	44	13	20	22	12	1		8	16		11	1	
85	76	44	12	20	21	12	1		7	16		11	1	
86	76	43	12	18	21	12			7	16		11	1	
87	76	43	11	18	21	12			7	16		11	1	
88	75	42	11	17	21	10			6	16		11	1	
89	75	41	10	17	20	10			6	15		11		
90	74	40	10	17	20	9			6	15		10		
91	74	38	9	17	20	9			6	15		10		
92	73	38	9	13	20	9			6	15		10		
93	71	38	9	13	20	9			5	15		10		
94	70	36	8	13	19	8			5	15		10		
95	69	36	8	13	19	8			5	15		10		
96	68	36	8	12	18	8			5	14		10		
97	68	35	7	11	18	7			5	14		10		
98	68	34	7	10	18	7			5	14		10		
99	67	34	7	10	18	6			5	14		10		
100	66	34	7	10	17	6			5	14		10		
101	65	33	7	9	17	6			5	14		9		
102	64	33	6	9	17	6			5	14		9		
103	64	33	6	9	17	6			5	14		9		
104	63	32	6	9	17	6			4	14		9		
105	63	32	5	8	17	5			4	13		9		
106	62	32	5	8	16	5			4	13		9		
107	61	31	5	8	16	5				13		9		
108	61	31	4	8	16	4				13		9		
109	60	31	4	7	16	4				13		9		
110	60	30	4	7	16	4				13		9		
111	59	30	4	6	16	4				13		9		
112	59	30	4	5	15	4				13		9		
113	58	29	3	5	15	3				13		8		
114	58	28	3	4	15	3				12		8		
115	56	27	3	4	15	3				12		8		
116	56	27	2	4	14	3				12		8		
117	56	27	2	3	14	2				12		8		
118	55	27	2	3	14	2				12		8		
119	55	27	1	3	14	2				12		7		
120	55	27	1	2	14	2				11		7		
121	55	27	1	2	13	2				11		7		
122	53	26	1	1	13	2				10		7		


Table A2 – Continued. Price awardees data and their h -, g - and g_d -indices (bases on Scopus, 21st February 2023)

	Price awardees													
	Leyde- sdorff	Glänzel	Moed	Van Raan	Rousseau	Schubert	Martin	Narin	Garfield	Braun	Small	Egghe	Ingwe- rsen	White
123	52	26	1	1	13	2				10		7		
124	51	26	1	1	13	2				10		7		
125	51	26	1		13	2				10		6		
126	49	26	1		13	2				10		6		
127	49	25	1		13	2				9		6		
128	48	25			13	2				9		6		
129	47	24			13	1				9		6		
130	46	24			13	1				9		6		
131	44	24			13	1				9		5		
132	44	23			13	1				9		5		
133	44	23			12	1				9		5		
134	44	23			12	1				9		5		
135	43	23			12	1				9		5		
136	43	23			12	1				8		5		
137	43	22			11	1				8		5		
138	43	21			11	1				8		5		
139	43	21			11	1				8		5		
140	43	21			11	1				8		5		
141	42	20			11	1				8		5		
142	42	19			11	1				8		5		
143	41	19			11					8		5		
144	41	18			11					8		4		
145	41	18			10					7		4		

Note:

 h -index

 g -index

 $g_3, g_4, g_5, \dots, g_{14}$ -indices