

# Scaling Behavior of the Hirsch Index for Failure Avalanches, Percolation Clusters and Paper Citations

Asim Ghosh,<sup>1,\*</sup> Bikas K. Chakrabarti,<sup>2,3,4,†</sup> Dacheppalli R. S. Ram,<sup>5,‡</sup> Manipushpak Mitra,<sup>3,§</sup> Raju Maiti,<sup>3,¶</sup> Soumyajyoti Biswas,<sup>5,\*\*</sup> and Suchismita Banerjee<sup>3,††</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Raghunathpur College, Raghunathpur, Purulia 723133, India.*

<sup>2</sup>*Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Kolkata 700064, India.*

<sup>3</sup>*Economic Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata 700108, India.*

<sup>4</sup>*S. N. Bose National Centre for Basic Sciences, Kolkata 700106, India.*

<sup>5</sup>*SRM University-AP, Andhra Pradesh - 522502, India.*

A popular measure for citation inequalities of individual scientists have been the Hirsch index ( $h$ ). If the number  $n_c$  of citations are plotted against the number  $n_p$  of papers (having those citations), then  $h$  corresponds to the fixed point (where  $n_c = h = n_p$ ) of the above-mentioned (non-linear) citation function of the scientists. The same index can be estimated (from  $h = s = n_s$ ) for the avalanche or cluster of size ( $s$ ) distributions ( $n_s$ ) in elastic fiber bundle or percolation models. We find, for stress ( $\sigma$ ) or lattice occupation probability ( $p$ ) near the bundle failure threshold ( $\sigma_c$ ) or percolation threshold ( $p_c$ ), a good fit to Widom-Stauffer like scaling  $h/[\sqrt{N}/\log N] = f(\sqrt{N}[\sigma_c - \sigma]^\alpha)$  or  $h/[\sqrt{N}/\log N] = f(\sqrt{N}[p_c - p]^\alpha)$ , with asymptotically defined scaling function  $f$ , for systems of size  $N$  (total number of fibers or lattice sites), and  $\alpha$  denoting the appropriate scaling exponent. As the critical intervals of the authors are not known, the citation  $h$ -index data for authors are simply fitted to  $h \sim \sqrt{N_c}/\log N_c \sim \sqrt{N_p}/\log N_p$  (as appropriate for the critical point) where  $N_p (= \sum n_p)$  denotes total number of papers and  $N_c (= \sum n_c)$  total number of citations of any individual author. We also show that if the number ( $N_m$ ) of members of parliaments or national assemblies of different countries (with population  $N$ ) is identified as their respective  $h$ -index, then the data fits the scaling relation  $N_m \sim \sqrt{N}/\log N$ , resolving a major recent controversy.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Monotonically and nonlinearly decaying inequality functions are ubiquitous. When the papers by any author (or an institution) are arranged from highest cited one to the lowest, it becomes a monotonically decaying nonlinear inequality function (see e.g., [1]). The same is true for avalanches in materials failure or in earthquakes (see e.g., [2]), cluster size distributions in percolation problems (see e.g., [3]), etc.. Large avalanches, strong quakes, or big size clusters come or occur in small numbers, while smaller or weaker the avalanches or quakes, or clusters, larger are their abundance in occurrence.

How does one measure statistically these inequalities in occurrence frequencies of citations or avalanches or cluster sizes? Obviously, the corresponding distribution functions for inequalities in citations or sizes would contain the entire statistics. However, they are not convenient to handle. One can consider the citation number of the best cited paper (as some times done for some unique awards, etc), or study the statistical (self-similar) structure of the biggest avalanche or the largest (percolating) cluster (as in statistical physics [3]). Hirsch proposed [1] an index to measure these inequalities, by locating the fixed point of the nonlinear inequality function. The Hirsch index ( $h$ ) corresponds to the citation number or occurrence frequency which is commensurate in magnitude with the number of publications or avalanche cluster sizes.

How does the  $h$  index scale with total number of publications ( $N_p$ ) by the author (institution) or the total number ( $N_c$ ) of citations received by the author (institution)? Young [4] suggested analytically

\* Email: asimghosh066@gmail.com

† Email: bikask.chakrabarti@saha.ac.in

‡ Email: dacheppalli\_ravi@srmap.edu.in

§ Email: manipushpak.mitra@gmail.com

¶ Email: rajumaiti@gmail.com

\*\* Email: soumyajyoti.b@srmap.edu.in

†† Email: suchib.1993@gmail.com




FIG. 1. A schematic drawing of the citation function of a typical scientist.  $h$ -index is given by its fixed point (intersection point of the 45 degree line from the origin), where citation number equals the number of papers and both becomes  $h$ . Similar will be the case where citations are replaced by the materials failure avalanche sizes (or cluster sizes) and the paper numbers are replaced by the number of such avalanches (or of the clusters in pre- or post-percolating systems).

that  $h$ -index value should scale with the total number of citations  $N_c$  as  $\sqrt{N_c}$  asymptotically. In ref. [5], a brief analysis of the Google Scholar data indicated independently that  $h \sim \sqrt{N_p}$  for large values of  $N_p$ , where  $N_p$  denotes the total number of publications by the author. Note that if both these relationships are valid then, statistically speaking, for a prolific author, the total number of citations would be linearly proportional to the total number of papers published and the proportionality constant would perhaps be determined by the size of the existing author network in the subject (suggesting an effective Dunbar number [6, 7], for the community of authors).

In a recent Monte Carlo study [8] on the avalanche sizes and their numbers in the Fiber Bundle Models (FBM) of materials failure (see e.g., [2, 9]) due to increasing stress on such bundles, the numerical analysis of the data for the nonlinearly decaying numbers of avalanches with their sizes (or released elastic energies) suggested  $h \sim \sqrt{N}/\log N$ .

Our numerical study here of avalanche size distributions in FBMs (for stress or load per fiber  $\sigma$  less than its global failure stress  $\sigma_c$ ) and of size distributions of clusters for lattice occupation concentration  $p$  near the percolation point  $p_c$  (for  $p$  both below and above  $p_c$ ) in percolating system, all show excellent fit to a Widom-Stauffer like scaling relation (c.f. [3]) between the Hirsch index ( $h$ ) and system size  $N$

$$\frac{h}{[\sqrt{N}/\log N]} = f(\sqrt{N}[\sigma_c - \sigma]^\alpha) \quad (1a)$$

$$= f(\sqrt{N}|p_c - p|^\alpha), \quad (1b)$$

with (asymptotically) well-defined scaling function  $f$  for systems of size  $N$  (total number of fibers or lattice sites/bonds), and  $\alpha$  denoting the appropriate scaling exponent.

As the critical intervals (equivalents of  $|\sigma - \sigma_c|$  or  $|p - p_c|$ ) are unknown for different authors, the citation  $h$  index data for the authors could not be fitted to the above-mentioned scaling relations

(1a,b) and simply fitted to the form appropriate to the critical point:

$$h \sim \sqrt{N_c}/\log N_c \quad (2a)$$

$$\sim \sqrt{N_p}/\log N_p, \quad (2b)$$

where  $N_p = \sum n_p$  denotes the total number of papers of any particular author and  $N_c = \sum n_c$  the total number of citations received from all the papers by that author. We also show that if the number ( $N_m$ ) of members of the parliaments or national assemblies of different countries (with corresponding population denoted by  $N$ ) are identified as those countries' respective  $h$  indices, then the data fits well to the scaling relation  $N_m \sim \sqrt{N}/\log N$ . This helps to comprehend the discrepancies (c.f. [10]) with the  $\sqrt{N}$  relationship, reported in a very recent analysis [11], resolving a major recent controversy.

## II. DATA ANALYSIS & NUMERICAL STUDIES

### A. Failure avalanches in fiber bundle model (FBM)

The fiber bundle model (FBM) is a generic model for failure of disordered solids. An ensemble of  $N$  fibers are set between two rigid parallel plates and a load is applied on the bottom plate. Each fiber is linear elastic, with the same elastic constant and has a failure threshold selected randomly from a distribution. This failure threshold is the source of disorder and non-linearity in the otherwise linear model.




FIG. 2. Finite size scaling analysis of the fiber bundle model  $h$ -index (from avalanche size distribution). The scaling fit to Widom-Stauffer relations (1) are obtained by making all the data points of different sizes ( $N = 1000, 5000, 10000$  and  $100000$ ) and stress level (different  $\sigma$  values) collapse together. It turns out that the scaling form (1b) with exponent  $\alpha = 1$  gives good data collapse. The inset shows that the data collapse clearly gets worsened by dropping the  $\log N$  term in the scaling relation (1b).

When a small load ( $W$ ) is applied, the weakest fiber breaks, and the load carried by that fiber is shared equally by all the remaining fibers, which can trigger further failures. Through gradual increase of load, therefore, the model goes through intermittent stable states, which are subsequently perturbed by increasing the load slowly. In going from one stable state to another, the number of fibers that break is the avalanche size ( $s$ ). The size distribution of this follows a power-law statistics

$P(s) \sim s^{-5/2}$  for  $s \rightarrow \infty$  [12]. The avalanche dynamics continues until the load per fiber value  $\sigma = W/N$  reaches a critical limit  $\sigma_c$ , when the entire system breaks down.

The avalanches are arranged in the ascending order to estimate  $h$  index values for stress level  $\sigma$  below  $\sigma_c$ . It was shown ([8]) that the terminal value of  $h$  ( $= h_f$ ) at the critical point ( $\sigma = \sigma_c$ ) follows a scaling relation  $h_f \sim \sqrt{N}/\log(N)$ . Here we look for the scaling of  $h$  with the critical interval  $(\sigma_c - \sigma)$ . It turns out that the scaling relation (1a) fits very well with our numerical the data (see Fig. 2). We also attempted the scaling fit without the  $\log(N)$  term in the above mentioned relation (see inset of Fig. 2) and it clearly worsens the data collapse.

The Fig.3 shows the scaling behavior for the average  $h$ -index (in the range  $4 \leq h \leq 20$ ) at the breaking point ( $\sigma = \sigma_c$ ) of the bundles with total number  $N$  (in the range  $200 \leq N \leq 20000$ ) of fibers in the equal-load-sharing FBM (with uniform distribution of fiber breaking thresholds) considered here (cf. [8]). The Fig. shows the best fit of  $h$  to  $\sqrt{N}/\log N$ .




FIG. 3. Scaling behavior for the average  $h$ -index (in the range  $4 \leq h \leq 20$ ) at the breaking point ( $\sigma = \sigma_c$ ) of the bundles with total number  $N$  (in the range  $200 \leq N \leq 20000$ ) of fibers in the equal-load-sharing FBM (with uniform distribution of fiber breaking thresholds) considered here (cf. [8]). The Fig. shows the best fit of  $h$  to  $\sqrt{N}/\log N$ . The inset shows statistical deviations  $\Sigma = \sqrt{\sum_i (h_d(i) - h_\gamma(i))^2 / \sum_i 1}$  to the scaling forms  $h \sim N^\gamma$  and  $h \sim N^\gamma/\log(N)$  with respect to  $\gamma$ , where  $i$  represents the individual (random) realization of the FBM with the corresponding  $h$  ( $= h_d$ ) value obtained from the simulation result and the scaling fit ( $h_\gamma$ ) from the above mentioned scaling relations.

## B. Percolation clusters in 2D lattice

Here we consider two-dimensional (2D) site percolation in a square lattice with site occupancy probability  $p$  ( $0 < p < 1$ ). For a given  $p$ , we measure cluster distribution, and hence the  $h$ -index is computed (here  $h$ -index measures  $h$  number of clusters each having cluster sizes greater than equal to  $h$ ). In our simulation, we took four different system sizes ( $N = 4000 \times 4000, 8000 \times 8000$  and  $16000 \times 16000$ ) and  $h$ -index was estimated for different  $p$  values.

Here we carry out the finite size scaling analysis [13] of the  $h$  index for different system sizes. The critical exponent  $\alpha$  is determined by fit to scaling relation (1b) for all the data points of different sizes ( $N = 4000 \times 4000, 8000 \times 8000$  and  $16000 \times 16000$ ). We obtain good data collapse with  $\alpha = 3$  and different scaling function  $f$  for  $p > p_c$  and  $p < p_c$  while they converge to the same value at  $p = p_c$

(see Fig 4). The inset of Fig. 4 shows the scaling fit to relation (1b) without the  $\log(N)$  term and it is observed that right hand side scaling fit is not that well.




FIG. 4. Finite size scaling analysis of the 2D site percolation  $h$ -index (from the cluster size distribution). The scaling fit to Widom-Stauffer relations (1) are obtained by making all the data points of different sizes ( $N = 4000 \times 4000, 8000 \times 8000$  and  $16000 \times 16000$ ) and concentrations (different  $p$  values,  $p_c = 0.5927$ ) collapse together. It turns out that the scaling form (1b) with exponent  $\alpha = 3$  gives good data collapse. The inset shows that the data collapse seems to get worsened by dropping the  $\log N$  term in the scaling relation (1b).

The cluster size distribution in the percolation problem has also been studied for estimating the  $h$ -index scaling with the total number  $N$  of lattice sites at the percolation threshold of site percolation on square lattice. We of course find here the best fit scaling form to be  $h \sim \sqrt{N}/\log N$  (see Fig. 5).

### C. Paper citations

We first analyze the data for  $h$ -index and its scaling with the total number of publications  $N_p$  and of citations  $N_c$  for the one hundred scientists (in mathematics, physics, chemistry, medicine, biology, economics, sociology; including those of twenty Nobel Laureates in those subjects), given in ref. [5]. Next, we collected (in May-June, 2021) the same kind of data<sup>1</sup> for one thousand scientists (mostly physicists) in all the above-mentioned subjects from Google Scholar.

The Fig. 6 shows that scaling behavior for the  $h$ -index (in the range  $20 \leq h \leq 222$ ) of the 100 scientists (data taken from [5]), with their the total number of citations  $N_c$  (in the range  $1819 \leq N_c \leq 323473$ ). Our analysis shows the best fit to  $h \sim \sqrt{N_c}/\log N_c$ .

The Figs 7(a,b) scaling behavior for the  $h$ -index (in the range  $17 \leq h \leq 221$ ) of the 1000 scientists with the total number of citations  $N_c$  (in the range  $996 \leq N_c \leq 348680$ ) in (a) and with the total number of papers  $N_p$  (in the range  $100 \leq N_p \leq 2987$ ) in (b). The data are taken from Google Scholar in June 2021. The Figs. show the best fits to  $h \sim \sqrt{N_c}/\log N_c$  in (a) and to  $h \sim \sqrt{N_p}/\log N_p$  in (b).

<sup>1</sup> The data will be available on request to corresponding author




FIG. 5. Scaling behavior for the  $h$ -index (in the range  $185 \leq h \leq 4421$ ) for cluster size distributions at the percolation point (with size  $N$  on square lattice;  $10^6 < N < 10^9$ ). The Fig. shows the best fit of  $h$  to  $\sqrt{N}/\log N$ . The inset shows the statistical deviations  $\Sigma = \sqrt{\sum_i (h_d(i) - h_\gamma(i))^2 / \sum_i 1}$  to the scaling forms  $h \sim N^\gamma$  and  $h \sim N^\gamma / \log(N)$  with respect to  $\gamma$ , where  $i$  represents the individual (random) realization of the percolating system with the corresponding  $h (= h_d)$  value obtained from the simulation result and the scaling fit ( $h_\gamma$ ) from the above mentioned scaling relations.




FIG. 6. Scaling behavior for the  $h$ -index (in the range  $20 \leq h \leq 222$ ) of the 100 scientists (data taken from [5]), with their the total number of citations  $N_c$  (in the range  $1819 \leq N_c \leq 323473$ ). Our analysis shows the best fit to  $h \sim \sqrt{N_c}/\log N_c$ . The inset shows the statistical deviations  $\Sigma = \sqrt{\sum_i (h_d(i) - h_\gamma(i))^2 / \sum_i 1}$  to the scaling forms  $h \sim N_c^\gamma$  and  $h \sim N_c^\gamma / \log(N_c)$  with respect to  $\gamma$ , where  $i$  represents the individual scientist with the corresponding  $h (= h_d)$  obtained from Google Scholar and the scaling fit ( $h_\gamma$ ) obtained from the above mentioned scaling relations.




FIG. 7. Scaling behavior for the  $h$ -index (in the range  $17 \leq h \leq 221$ ) of the 1000 scientists with the total number of citations  $N_c$  (in the range  $996 \leq N_c \leq 348680$ ) in (a) and with the total number of papers  $N_p$  (in the range  $100 \leq N_p \leq 2987$ ) in (b). The data are taken from Google Scholar in June 2021. The Figs. show the best fits to  $h \sim \sqrt{N_c}/\log N_c$  in (a) and to  $h \sim \sqrt{N_p}/\log N_p$  in (b). The insets show the statistical deviations  $\Sigma = \sqrt{\sum_i (h_d(i) - h_\gamma(i))^2 / \sum_i 1}$  to the scaling forms  $h \sim N_p^\gamma$  (or  $h \sim N_c^\gamma$ ) and  $h \sim N_p^\gamma/\log(N_p)$  (or  $h \sim N_c^\gamma/\log(N_c)$ ) with respect to  $\gamma$ , where  $i$  represents the individual scientist with the corresponding  $h$  ( $= h_d$ ) value obtained from Google Scholar and the scaling fit ( $h_\gamma$ ) from the above mentioned scaling relations.

### D. Number of the representatives in the National Assemblies

Finally, we note that if the number  $N_s$  of the representatives in the National Assemblies or in the Parliaments of different countries of the world are identified as the  $h$ -index for respective country,

having population  $N$ , then we find (see Fig. 8) that the data analyzed in ref [10]<sup>2</sup> shows the best fit of  $N_m$  to  $\sqrt{N}/\log N$ . This also resolves the discrepancy noted in the analysis if the same data ([11] and references therein).




FIG. 8. Scaling behavior for the number  $N_m$  (in the range  $15 \leq N_m \leq 3040$ ) of the representatives in National assemblies or Parliaments of different countries of the world (1972 data from the original study [10]; see also [11]) with total population  $N$  (in the range  $19 \times 10^4 \leq N \leq 70.5 \times 10^7$ ) of the respective countries. When  $N_m$  is identified as the  $h$ -index for the countries, we get  $N_m \sim \sqrt{N}/\log N_m$  which is fitted here with the data. The inset shows the statistical deviations  $\Sigma = \sqrt{\sum_i (N_{md}(i) - N_{m\gamma}(i))^2 / \sum_i 1}$  to the scaling forms  $N_m \sim N^\gamma$  and  $N_m \sim N^\gamma / \log(N)$  with respect to  $\gamma$ , where  $i$  represents the individual country with the corresponding members of parliaments  $N_m (= N_{md})$  and the scaling fit  $(N_{m\gamma})$  from the above mentioned scaling relations. This resolves the discrepancy noted in the analysis of the same data in ref. [11].

### III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

We have redefined here the Hirsch index  $h$  for citation inequalities [1] to those for the unequal distributions of avalanche or cluster sizes in physical systems like the fiber bundle models (see e.g., [2][9]) and percolating systems (see e.g., [3, 13]). Indeed, surprising successes of such Hirsch-like social inequality measures were already seen (see e.g., [8, 14]) in predicting the global failures in fiber bundles and the self-organized critical points of sand-pile systems. We show here, from the Monte Carlo simulation results (see sections IIA and IIB), that the Widom-Stauffer-like scaling relation (1a,b) of the Hirsch index  $h$  (defined here for the size  $s$  distributions  $n_s$ , through  $h = s = n_s$ ) fit remarkably

<sup>2</sup> The data extracted from this paper can be found in <https://sciencehistory.epfl.ch/physics-and-sociology/>



well with the system size  $N$  (see Figs. 2 and 4). We also show (see the insets of Figs. 2 and 4) that the scaling collapse breaks down without the  $\log N$  term in (1) (visibly clear for the fiber bundle results in Fig. 2).

As is well known, the Hirsch index ( $h$ ) was introduced originally to measure the inequalities in success (through citations in the subsequent literature) of the contributions (papers) of individual scientists. The citation function (see Fig. 1), is an well documented nonlinear and monotonically decaying function (cf. Zipf law [15]).  $h$  corresponds to the fixed point of this citation function. Analytical study [4], as well as numerical data analysis (see e.g., [5]), suggested  $h \sim \sqrt{N_c} \sim \sqrt{N_p}$ , for any author having  $N_p$  total papers and  $N_c$  total citations. Since for different scientists, we do not have any knowledge of the critical intervals (like  $|\sigma_c - \sigma|$  or  $|p_c - p|$  in relations (1)) here the detailed data for  $h$  are fitted to the relations (2) (see section IIC, Figs. 6, 7(a,b)) assuming the critical interval to be zero for the chosen authors. We show a better fit is  $h \sim \sqrt{N_c}/\log N_c \sim \sqrt{N_p}/\log N_p$  (see relations (2a,b)). It may be noted that while some earlier analysis with small data sets (e.g., in [16, 17]) indicated a fit to  $h \sim N^\gamma$ , with  $\gamma = 0.5$ , analysis of a much larger data set (see e.g., [16, 18]) indicated significantly lower value ( $\simeq 0.42$ ) of  $\gamma$ . As may be seen from our analysis (see Figs. 6 and 7), this is probably due to the choices of data corresponding to very large deviations from the respective critical points to fit power law scaling form and the missing  $\log N$  term (in relations (2)) in the scaling form. It suggests, in absence of this information, extending the data sets for scientists who may not be that competitive may lead to wrong conclusions. In fact, while all the data for  $h$ -index of FBM avalanches and percolation clusters fit so well with the Widom-Stauffer scaling (2) with  $\gamma = 1/2$ , when the data for their critical points are fitted to  $h \sim N^\gamma$  (see insets of Figs, 3 and 5), one gets best fits for  $\gamma$  around 0.40 and 0.48 respectively.

We also show that when the number  $N_m$  of the members of national assemblies or of parliaments for different countries of the world are identified effectively as their Hirsch index  $h$ , then  $N_m$  indeed would scale (see Fig. 8 in section IID) with the total population  $N$  as  $\sqrt{N}/\log N$  for the respective countries. This observation should help comprehending the discrepancies with the proposed  $N_m \sim \sqrt{N}$  relationship, reported in a very recent analysis [11].

For an additional check for the  $\log N$  term in the scaling behaviour of the Hirsch index, we fitted the data for  $h$  in Fiber bundle models (section IIA, at  $\sigma = \sigma_c$ ), for percolation systems (section IIB,  $p = p_c$ ), paper citations data (section IIC) and parliament membership data (section IID) to the scaling form  $h = a\sqrt{N}$  or  $h = \bar{a}\sqrt{N}/\log(N)$ . The estimated best fit values of the pre-factors  $a$  or  $\bar{a}$  are given in Table I. The range of error bars in these estimates of  $a$  and  $\bar{a}$  are such that, more than 95% of the data points fall within the indicated ranges. If we assume the value of the pre-factor to be the same across the systems considered (Young's asymptotic result [4] suggested the value of the pre-factor  $a$  for citation to be about 0.54), the observed fitting error ranges for other systems (see Table I) then clearly suggest the fit with  $\log N$  term to be more appropriate. In fact, the average value of the pre-factor ( $\bar{a} \sim 2.5$  in Table I) fits reasonably across the systems considered and also agrees with the values of  $f(0)$  in Figs. 2 (for FBM) and 4 (for percolating) systems. The agreements of the values of  $\bar{a}$  with large error bars in table I) and  $f(0)$  in Figs. 2 and 4 (with much smaller error bars) clearly indicates the problem of fitting the  $h$ -index values to scaling relations without any consideration for the (known) critical intervals. These errors due to the fittings with scaling relations (2) therefore become much more prominent for citation or parliament member number data, where the critical intervals (individual author's or country's distance from the respective critical point) are completely unknown.

TABLE I. Values of the pre-factors  $a$  and  $\bar{a}$  for  $h$ -index scaling fits.

|   | FBM avalanche sizes | percolation cluster sizes | citation sizes  | parliament sizes |
|---|---------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| fit to $h = a\sqrt{N}$<br>$a =$                     | $0.15 \pm 0.10$     | $0.25 \pm 0.10$           | $0.40 \pm 0.25$ | $0.10 \pm 0.08$  |
| fit to $h = \bar{a}\sqrt{N}/\log(N)$<br>$\bar{a} =$ | $2.00 \pm 0.75$     | $2.50 \pm 1.00$           | $3.50 \pm 2.00$ | $1.75 \pm 1.00$  |

In this paper, we have explored the best fit of the Hirsch index values  $h$  for system sizes  $N$  with a Widom-Stauffer like scaling form (1a,b), essentially based on the Monte Carlo data collapse in fiber bundle model and percolating systems (for  $\sigma$  or  $p$  away from  $\sigma_c$  or  $p_c$  respectively; see Figs. 2 and 4). Data for citations and parliament members are fitted (see Figs. 6 and 8) to the (effective) critical point relation (2), as the equivalent critical interval ( $[\sigma_c - \sigma]$  or  $|p_c - p|$ ) are unknown. We find the scaling fit (to relations (1) and (2)) deteriorate considerably if the  $\log N$  term is dropped. We give in the table I the estimated error in the pre-factors  $a$  and  $\bar{a}$ , and assuming the pre-factor to have the same value across the systems considered we again find the scaling relation with  $\log N$  term ( $h = \bar{a}\sqrt{N}/\log N$ ,  $\bar{a} \equiv f(0)$  of Widom-Stauffer relations (1)) to be more appropriate for the scaling behaviour of Hirsch index at the respective critical points.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Parongama Sen and Filippo Radicchi for bringing ref. [11] and refs [16–18] to our attention. BKC is thankful to the Indian National Science Academy for their Senior Scientist Research Grant.

- 
- [1] Jorge E Hirsch. An index to quantify an individual’s scientific research output. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102(46):16569–16572, 2005.
  - [2] Soumyajyoti Biswas, Purusattam Ray, and Bikas K Chakrabarti. *Statistical physics of fracture, breakdown, and earthquake: effects of disorder and heterogeneity*. John Wiley & Sons, 2015.
  - [3] Dietrich Stauffer and Ammon Aharony. *Introduction to percolation theory*. CRC press, 2018.
  - [4] Alexander Yong. Critique of hirsch’s citation index: A combinatorial fermi problem. *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*, 61(9):1040–1050, 2014.
  - [5] Asim Ghosh and Bikas K Chakrabarti. Limiting value of the kolkata index for social inequality and a possible social constant. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 573:125944, 2021.
  - [6] Robin IM Dunbar. Neocortex size as a constraint on group size in primates. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 22(6):469–493, 1992.
  - [7] Kunal Bhattacharya, Asim Ghosh, Daniel Monsivais, Robin IM Dunbar, and Kimmo Kaski. Sex differences in social focus across the life cycle in humans. *Royal Society Open Science*, 3(4):160097, 2016.
  - [8] Soumyajyoti Biswas and Bikas K Chakrabarti. Social inequality analysis of fiber bundle model statistics and prediction of materials failure. *Physical Review E*, 104(4):044308, 2021.
  - [9] Srutarshi Pradhan, Alex Hansen, and Bikas K Chakrabarti. Failure processes in elastic fiber bundles. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 82(1):499, 2010.
  - [10] Rein Taagepera. The size of national assemblies. *Social Science Research*, 1(4):385–401, 1972.
  - [11] Giorgio Margaritondo. Size of national assemblies: The classic derivation of the cube-root law is conceptually flawed. *Frontiers in Physics*, 8:606, 2021.
  - [12] Alex Hansen. The distribution of simultaneous fiber failures in fiber bundles. *Journal of Applied Mechanics*, 59:909, 1992.
  - [13] Dietrich Stauffer. Scaling theory of percolation clusters. *Physics reports*, 54(1):1–74, 1979.
  - [14] Subhrangshu Sekhar Manna, Soumyajyoti Biswas, and Bikas K Chakrabarti. Near universal values of social inequality indices in self-organized critical models. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 596:127121, 2022.
  - [15] George Kingsley Zipf. *Selected Studies of the Principle of Relative Frequency in Language*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1932.
  - [16] Sidney Redner. On the meaning of the h-index. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2010(03):L03005, 2010.
  - [17] Hendrik C Spruit. The relative significance of the h-index. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1201.5476*, 2012.
  - [18] Filippo Radicchi and Claudio Castellano. Analysis of bibliometric indicators for individual scholars in a large data set. *Scientometrics*, 97(3):627–637, 2013.