Theory and practise of the g-index

Peer-reviewed author version

Theory and practise of the
g-index

by

L. Egghe[1(*),2]

[1]   Universiteit Hasselt (UHasselt), Campus Diepenbeek, Agoralaan, B-3590 Diepenbeek, Belgium[1]

[2]   Universiteit Antwerpen (UA), Campus Drie Eiken, Universiteitsplein 1, B-2610 Wilrijk, Belgium

leo.egghe@uhasselt.be

ABSTRACT

The g-index is introduced as an improvement of the h-index of Hirsch to measure the global citation performance of a set of articles. If this set is ranked in decreasing order of the number of citations that they received, the g-index is the (unique) largest number such that the top g articles received (together) at least g^2 citations. We prove the unique existence of g for any set of articles and we have that $g \geq h$.

The general Lotkaian theory of the g-index is presented and we show that

$$g = \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 2} \right)^{\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha}} T^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$$

where $\alpha > 2$ is the Lotkaian exponent and where T denotes the total number of sources.

We then present the g-index of the (still active) Price medallists for their complete careers up to 1972 and compare it with the h-index. It is shown that the g-index inherits all the good properties of the h-index and, in addition, better takes into account the citation scores of the top articles. This yields a better distinction between and order of the scientists from the point of view of visibility.

I. Introduction

Recently the physicist Hirsch (see Hirsch (2005)) introduced the so-called h-index – see also Ball (2005), Braun, Glänzel and Schubert (2005), Glänzel (2006a,b), Egghe and Rousseau (2006). For any general "set of papers" one can arrange these papers in decreasing order of the number of citations they received. The h-index is then the largest rank $h = r$ such that the paper on this rank (and hence also all papers on rank 1,…,h) has h or more citations. Hence the papers on ranks $h + 1$, $h + 2$, … have not more than h citations.

Although introduced by a physicist, this new science indicator has been well-received in scientometrics (informetrics). In the above mentioned references it was argued that the h-index is a simple single number incorporating publication as well as citation data (hence comprising quantitative as well as qualitative or visibility aspects) and hence has an advantage over numbers such as "number of significant papers" (which is arbitrary) or "number of citations to each of the (say) q most cited papers" (which again is not a single number). The h-index is also robust in the sense that it is insensitive to a set of uncited (or lowly cited) papers but also it is insensitive to one or several outstandingly highly cited papers. This last aspect can be considered as a drawback of the h-index. Let us discuss this point further.

Highly cited papers are, of course, important for the determination of the value h of the h-index. But once a paper is selected to belong to the top h papers, this paper is not "used" any more in the determination of h, as a variable over time. Indeed, once a paper is selected to the top group, the h-index calculated in subsequent years is not at all influenced by this paper's

received citations further on: even if the paper doubles or triples its number of citations (or even more) the subsequent h-indexes are not influenced by this. We think it is an advantage of the h-index not to take into account the "tail" papers (with low number of citations) but it should (being a measure of overall citation performance) take into account the citation evolution of the most cited papers!

In order to overcome this disadvantage, whilst keeping the advantages of the h-index, we make the following remark: by definition of the h-index, the papers on rank 1,…,h each have at least h citations, hence these h papers together have at least h^2 citations. But it could well be (see examples further on) that the first $h+1$ papers have together $(h+1)^2$ or more citations (here we use the fact that, most probably, the top papers have much more than h citations) and the same might be true for ranks $h+2$ (the top $(h+2)$ papers having together at least $(h+2)^2$ citations) or even higher.

Therefore, in the Letter Egghe (2006a) we introduced a simple variant of the h-index: the g-index.

Definition I.1:

A set of papers has a g-index g if g is the highest rank such that the top g papers have, together, at least g^2 citations. This also means that the top $g+1$ papers have less than $(g+1)^2$ papers.

The following proposition (also remarked in Egghe (2006a)) is trivial.

Proposition I.2:

In all cases one has that

$$g \geq h \tag{1}$$

Proof:

Since h satisfies the requirement that the top h papers have at least h^2 papers and since g is the largest number with this property, it is clear that $g \geq h$. $\qquad\square$

An example shows the easy calculation of the h-index and the g-index. The data are the author's own citation data derived from the Web of Knowledge (WoK). It must be underlined, however, that the real citation data can be much higher due to several reasons:

- only source journals, selected by Thomson ISI are used,
- unclear citations (even to source journals, e.g. "to appear" etc.) are not counted in the WoK.

In the table below TC stands for the total number of citations for each paper on rank $r = 1, 2, ...$ and ΣTC stands for the cumulative number of citations to the papers on rank $1, ..., r$ (for each r). The bold face typed numbers give the explanation for the h-index $h = 13$ and the g-index $g = 19$. Indeed $h = 13$ is the highest rank such that all papers on rank $1, ..., h$ have at least 13 citations (and hence the papers on rank 14 or higher have not more than 13 citations). Also $g = 19$ is the highest rank such that the top 19 papers have at least $19^2 = 361$ citations (here $381 > 361$); on rank 20 we have $392 < 20^2 = 400$ citations.

Table 1. Ranking of the papers of L. Egghe according to their
number of citations received (source: WoK).

TC	r	ΣTC	r^2
47	1	47	1
42	2	89	4
37	3	126	9
36	4	162	16
21	5	183	25
18	6	201	36
17	7	218	49
16	8	234	64
16	9	250	81
16	10	266	100
15	11	281	121
13	12	294	144
13	**13**	307	169
13	14	320	196
13	15	333	225
12	16	345	256
12	17	357	289
12	18	369	324
12	**19**	**381**	**361**
11	20	392	400

In the last section of this article we will compare the h- and g-indexes of the (active) Price medallists (updated calculations of the h-index as in Glänzel and Persson (2005) and new calculations of the g-index) showing the advantage of the g-index above the h-index but in the next section we will give the mathematical theory of the g-index based on Lotka's law

$$f(j) = \frac{C}{j^{\alpha}} \qquad (2)$$

$j \geq 1$, $C > 0$, $\alpha > 2$ (it will turn out that, if we let j to be arbitrary large – which we assume here for the sake of simplicity – we need to take $\alpha > 2$). In case of (2) we will show that (T = total number of sources (= papers here))

$$g = \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 2} \right)^{\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha}} T^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \qquad (3)$$

, hence by Glänzel (2006b) or Egghe and Rousseau (2006), since one showed there that $h = T^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$, we have

$$g = \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 2} \right)^{\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha}} h > h \qquad (4)$$

Also the relation of g with the total number A of items (= citations here) is given. Before this theory is developed we will, firstly, show the general existence theorem for the g-index: for any set of papers we always have that the g-index exists and is unique.

Note, cf. Braun, Glänzel and Schubert (2005), Egghe (2006a), Egghe and Rousseau (2006), that any set of papers can be taken here, e.g. the papers of a scientist but also a year's production (articles) in a journal can be used.

II. Mathematical theory of the g-index

First we will give a mathematically exact definition of the g-index in continuous variables.

II.1 Mathematical definition of the g-index

Let $f(j)$ $(j \geq 1)$ denote the general size-frequency function of the system (which can be more general than the papers-citation relation: we can work in general information production processes (IPPs) where we have sources that produce items – cf. Egghe and Rousseau (1990), Egghe (2005)). We do not suppose f to be Lotkaian at this moment. Let $g(r)$ $(r \in [0, T])$ denote the general rank-frequency function (the function $g(r)$ should not be confused with the g-index; we keep the $f(j)$ and $g(r)$ notation since this has been done in all previous articles and books on this topic – throughout the text it will be clear whether we deal with the function $g(r)$ or with the g-index g). The general (defining) relation between the functions $f(j)$ and $g(r)$ is as follows:

$$r = g^{-1}(j) = \int_{j}^{\infty} f(j') dj' \qquad (5)$$

Indeed, if $r = g^{-1}(j)$ (the inverse of the function $g(r)$) then $g(r) = j$ and there are r sources with an item density value larger than or equal to j. Denote

$$G(r) = \int_{0}^{r} g(r') dr' \qquad (6)$$

the cumulative number of items in the sources up to rank r (i.e. the top r sources).

Definition:
The rank r is the g-index: $r = g$ of this system if r is the highest value such that

$$G(r) \geq r^2 \qquad (7)$$

Note that this is the exact formulation of the g-index as proposed in Section I in practical systems.

II.2 Existence theorem for the g-index

Theorem II.2.1

Every general system has a unique g-index.

Proof:

Define, for all $r \in \left]0,T\right]$

$$H(r) = \frac{G(r)}{r} \tag{8}$$

and we define $H(0) = \lim_{\substack{r \to 0 \\ >}} H(r) = g(0)$. We first prove that H strictly decreases on $\left[0,T\right]$. Indeed

$$H'(r) = \frac{rg(r) - G(r)}{r^2} < 0$$

since

$$rg(r) < G(r) = \int_0^r g(r')dr'$$

since the function g is strictly decreasing (by (5)) for all values of $r \in \left]0,T\right]$. Since $H(0) = \lim_{\substack{r \to 0 \\ >}} H(r)$ we hence have that H strictly decreases on $\left[0,T\right]$. If $H(T) \geq T$ then $G(T) \geq T^2$ and since this is the largest possible value, we have the unique g-index $g = T$. Suppose now that $H(T) < T$. Define

$$F(r) = H(r) - r \tag{9}$$

$$F(r) = \frac{G(r)}{r} - r$$

Since $H(0) > 0$ (since the function g strictly decreases (by (5)) and by (8)) and $H(T) < T$ we have $F(0) > 0$ and $F(T) < 0$. Hence, since F is continuous, there is a value r such that $F(r) = 0$. By (8) and (9) we hence have the existence of a value r such that

$$G(r) = r^2$$

Note that this satisfies (7) and that it is the highest possible value that satisfies (7): indeed, H strictly decreases, so, for every value $r' > r$ we have

$$H(r') < H(r)$$

By (8):

$$\frac{G(r')}{r'} < \frac{G(r)}{r} = r$$

$$G(r') < rr' < r'^2$$

contradicting (7). Hence this unique r value is the g-index: $r = g$. Note that, except if $G(T) \geq T^2$, we can prove that the g-index always satisfies (7) with an equality sign instead of $\geq$. $\square$

Now we will give formulae for the g-index in terms of parameters that appear in Lotkaian informetrics.

II.3 Formulae for the g-index in Lotkaian systems

If $G(T) \leq T^2$ then we know from the proof of Theorem II.2.1 that the g-index satisfies (7) with an equality sign:

$$G(g) = g^2 \tag{10}$$

Otherwise (if $G(T) > T^2$) we take $g = T$.

We have the following theorem.

Theorem II.3.1:

Given the law of Lotka

$$f(j) = \frac{C}{j^\alpha} \tag{11}$$

$j \geq 1$, $C > 0$, $\alpha > 2$, we have that the g-index equals

$$g = \left(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha-2}\right)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} T^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \tag{12}$$

if $\left(\dfrac{\alpha-1}{\alpha-2}\right)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} T^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \leq T$ and $g = T$ if $\left(\dfrac{\alpha-1}{\alpha-2}\right)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} T^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} > T$.

Here T denotes the total number of sources.

Proof:

First proof:

The first (cf. (5))

$$r = g^{-1}(j) = \int_j^\infty f(j')dj'$$

$$= \frac{C}{\alpha-1} j^{1-\alpha} \tag{13}$$

sources yield a total number of items (since $\alpha > 2$)

$$\int_j^\infty j' f(j')dj' = \frac{C}{\alpha-2} j^{2-\alpha} \tag{14}$$

(cf. also Egghe (2005), Chapter II).

So, by (10) we have $r = g$ if

$$\frac{C}{\alpha - 2} j^{2-\alpha} = g^2 \tag{15}$$

and if this g satisfies $g \le T$ (otherwise take $g = T$).

By (13):

$$j = \left(\frac{(\alpha-1)r}{C}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \tag{16}$$

(16) (for $r = g$) in (15) yields

$$g = \left[\frac{C}{\alpha - 2}\left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{C}\right)^{\frac{\alpha-2}{\alpha-1}}\right]^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}$$

$$g = \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 2}\right)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} T^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$$

using that $T = \frac{C}{\alpha - 1}$ as follows from (13) by taking $j = 1$. This value is taken as the g-index if it is $\le T$ and we take $g = T$ if it is strictly larger than T.

Second proof:

Now we work directly with formula (10). Note that Lotka's law (11) is equivalent with Zipf's law

$$g(r) = \frac{B}{r^{\beta}} \tag{17}$$

B, $\beta > 0$, $r \in \left]0, T\right]$ where we have the relations

$$B = \left(\frac{C}{\alpha - 1}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha - 1}} \tag{18}$$

$$\beta = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \tag{19}$$

(cf. Egghe (2005), Exercise II.2.2.6 but see also the Appendix in Egghe and Rousseau (2006) where a proof is given.).

Note that by (19) $\alpha > 2$ is equivalent with $0 < \beta < 1$. If that is the case, (10) gives

$$\int_0^g \frac{B}{r^\beta} dr = g^2$$

hence, since $0 < \beta < 1$

$$\frac{B}{1 - \beta} g^{1 - \beta} = g^2$$

Hence

$$g = \left(\frac{B}{1 - \beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta + 1}} \tag{20}$$

Now (18) and (19) in (20) again yield formula (12). $\qquad\square$

Corollary II.3.2:

If g is the g-index and h is the h-index of a Lotkaian system with exponent $\alpha > 2$, then

$$g = \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 2}\right)^{\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha}} h \tag{21}$$

(if this value is $\leq T$; otherwise $g = T$).

Proof:

This follows readily from (12) and the fact that $h = T^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$, see Egghe and Rousseau (2006) (also proved, approximatively, in Glänzel (2006b)). $\square$

Taking $j = 1$ in (13) and (14) we see that the total number of sources T equals $\dfrac{C}{\alpha - 1}$ and that the total number of items A equals $\dfrac{C}{\alpha - 2}$, hence

$$\mu = \frac{A}{T} = \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 2} \tag{22}$$

equals the average number of items per source (cf. also Egghe (2005), Chapter II). Hence we have the following corollary

Corollary II.3.3:

If μ is as above we have in case of (21)

$$g = \mu^{\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha}} h \tag{23}$$

The g-index in function of α and A is as in Corollary II.3.4.

Corollary II.3.4:

We have

$$g = \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 2} \right)^{\frac{\alpha - 2}{\alpha}} A^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \tag{24}$$

(if this value is $\leq T$).

Proof:

This follows readily from (22) and (12). $\square$

We can also determine the item density j for which we have $r = g$. In practical cases this means the number of items in the source at rank g. Note that this is h for the h-index $r = h$, by definition of the Hirsch index.

For the g-index we have: if the value in (12) is $> T$ we have $j = g(T) = 1$ and if the value in (12) is $\leq T$ we substitute $r = g$ in (17), using (18) and (19) and the fact that $T = \dfrac{C}{\alpha - 1}$, yielding

$$j = \left(\frac{\alpha - 2}{\alpha - 1} T \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \tag{26}$$

We immediately see that $j < h$ which is logical since $g > h$ and the item density is h in case $r = h$. Formula (26) presents a concrete formula for the item density cut-off place.

Note that, although α can be any value $\alpha > 2$, we do __not__ have $\lim\limits_{\substack{\alpha \to 2 \\ >}} j = 0$. Indeed since the validity of (12) is limited to $g \leq T$ we have, by (12) that

$$\left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 2} \right)^{\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha}} T^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \leq T$$

from which it follows that

$$\mu = \frac{A}{T} = \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 2} \leq T \tag{27}$$

This implies in (26) that

$$j = \left(\frac{T^2}{A}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \geq 1$$

, by (27).

The case

$$\left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 2}\right)^{\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha}} T^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} > T \tag{28}$$

(hence where we take $g = T$) occurs in the following case: from (28) it follows that

$$\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 2} > T \tag{29}$$

By (22) we have

$$\mu = \frac{A}{T} > T$$

hence

$$A > T^2 \tag{30}$$

Equivalently, (29) gives the condition in α:

$$\alpha < \frac{2T - 1}{T - 1} \tag{31}$$

Note that

$$\frac{2T - 1}{T - 1} > 2$$

so that (31) can occur (with the condition $\alpha > 2$).

Remark II.3.5:

It might seem strange that $g = T$ is possible in this Lotkaian model. Note however that (22) implies that

$$\alpha = \frac{2A - T}{A - T}$$

So, for every T fixed, if we let $A \to \infty$ we have that $\alpha \to 2$ (but $\alpha > 2$) so that we are within the limitations of our theory. In this case we have

$$A = G(T) > T^2$$

and hence $g = T$.

In the next section we will apply the g-index to the publications and citations of the (still active) Price medallists and compare these g-indexes with the h-indexes of these same data.

III. Calculation and comparison of the h- and g-indexes of the (still active) Price medallists

In Glänzel and Persson (2005), the h-indexes for the (still active) Price medallists are calculated. We could use these numbers and compare them with the here defined g-index. However for this we need to extend the tables in Glänzel and Persson (2005) (since $g \geq h$) and it is hardly impossible to do this since we should do this for the maximal citing time August 2005 (since then the tables in Glänzel and Persson (2005) were produced). So the easiest thing to do is to remake these tables for the present time (January 2006) and make them long enough so that, on the same tables, the h- as well as the g-index can be calculated.

We have opted <u>not</u> to limit the publication year to 1986 or higher (as was the case in Glänzel and Persson (2005)). Indeed, the h-indexes in Glänzel and Persson (2005) seemed a bit unnatural in several senses. E. Garfield did not have the highest h-index (which we, normally, could expect) and H. Small scored lowest of all the Price medallists. The major reason for these observations is that, by limiting the publication year to 1986 or higher, one cuts away most publications (and perhaps the highest cited ones) of the relatively older scientists. Since we want to make a comparison of scientists (and not to draw conclusions on informetrics fields) we decided not to limit the publication year (except to the evident limit 1972 since before that date the ISI (now Thomson ISI) data do not exist.

For the same reason we count all publications even if scientists have published in different domains (e.g. T. Braun in chemistry and L. Egghe in mathematics). These publications were not used in the Glänzel and Persson study.

Of course, by not limiting the publication period and the publication field, one might argue that there is a bias towards the older scientists. This is true but, with the h- and g-indexes, we want to indicate the "overall performance (visibility)" of the scientists as they are viewn today (in the sense of "lifetime achievement").

We base ourselves on the Web of Knowledge (WoK) and hence we are limited to the Thomson ISI data. This means that no citations to non-source journals or conference proceedings articles or books are counted. In addition, no citations to incomplete references are counted even if they are to source journal articles (e.g. a citation to JASIST, 2001, to appear): these are not collected in the WoK "times cited" data. So the actual h- and g-indexes can be somewhat higher but this effect plays for every scientist so that comparisons are still possible and also these limitations do not jeopardise the possibility to compare the h- and g-index.

The tables of citation data of the (still active) medallists are found in the Appendix. The table stops one line below the g-index since this is all we need. The number r denotes the rank of the publication and TC denotes the total number of citations to the paper on rank r. The number ΣTC denotes the cumulative number of citations to the first r ranked papers. Finally, also the table of r^2 values is presented as well as the publication year (PY) of the article on

rank r. The h- and g-index determination is highlighted in the tables in the Appendix. Table 2 gives the results in decreasing order of h and g.

Table 2. h- and g-indexes of Price medallists
in decreasing order

Name	h-index		Name	g-index
Garfield	27		Garfield	59
Narin	27		Narin	40
Braun	25		Small	39
Van Raan	19		Braun	38
Glänzel	18		Schubert	30
Moed	18		Glänzel	27
Schubert	18		Martin	27
Small	18		Moed	27
Martin	16		Van Raan	27
Egghe	13		Ingwersen	26
Ingwersen	13		White	25
Leydesdorff	13		Egghe	19
Rousseau	13		Leydesdorff	19
White	12		Rousseau	15

We leave the detailed (subjective) interpretation of Table 2 to the reader but it is clear that the g-index column is more in line with intuition and with the raw data in the Appendix than the h-index column. In other words, the g-index, as simple as the h-index (a single measure, containing publication and citation elements), contains more comparative information from the raw data than the h-index and resembles more the overall feeling of "visibility" or "life time achievement".

A possible interesting measure is $\frac{g}{h}$, i.e. the relative increase of g with respect to h. The result is presented in Table 3, in decreasing order of $\frac{g}{h}$. Here we see remarkable order changes with respect to the h- or g-orderings.

Table 3. $\frac{g}{h}$ -values of Price medallists in decreasing order

Name	$\frac{g}{h}$
Garfield	2.19
Small	2.17
White	2.08
Ingwersen	2.00
Martin	1.69
Schubert	1.67
Braun	1.52
Glänzel	1.50
Moed	1.50
Narin	1.48
Egghe	1.46
Leydesdorff	1.46
Van Raan	1.42
Rousseau	1.15

Appendix

Tables of TC, r, ΣTC, r^2 and PY for each of the (still active) Price medallists and determination of the h- and g-index.

Garfield E.

TC	r	ΣTC	r^2	PY
625	1	625	1	1972
149	2	774	4	1980
138	3	912	9	1977
132	4	1044	16	1983
132	5	1176	25	1981
129	6	1305	36	1979
127	7	1432	49	1996
111	8	1543	64	1978
109	9	1652	81	1975
108	10	1760	100	1985
107	11	1867	121	1984
105	12	1972	144	1982
104	13	2076	169	1986
101	14	2177	196	1976
96	15	2273	225	1973
91	16	2364	256	1976
89	17	2453	289	1974
88	18	2541	324	1986
87	19	2628	361	1987
85	20	2713	400	1979
80	21	2793	441	1985
67	22	2860	484	1988
63	23	2923	529	1999
41	24	2964	576	1980
29	25	2993	625	1990
28	26	3021	676	1987
27	**27**	3048	729	1987
26	28	3074	784	1976
26	29	3100	841	1992
23	30	3123	900	1978
23	31	3146	961	1990
20	32	3166	1024	1990
19	33	3185	1089	1998
19	34	3204	1156	1998
18	35	3222	1225	1985
18	36	3240	1296	1979
18	37	3258	1369	1996

16	38	3274	1444	1979
15	39	3289	1521	1990
14	40	3303	1600	1976
13	41	3316	1681	1973
13	42	3329	1764	1973
13	43	3342	1849	1973
13	44	3355	1936	1998
13	45	3368	2025	1990
12	46	3380	2116	1973
12	47	3392	2209	2000
12	48	3404	2304	1998
12	49	3416	2401	1997
12	50	3428	2500	1996
11	51	3439	2601	1998
11	52	3450	2704	1997
10	53	3460	2809	1985
10	54	3470	2916	1984
9	55	3479	3025	1984
9	56	3488	3136	1975
9	57	3497	3249	1972
9	58	3506	3364	2002
9	59	3515	3481	1998
9	60	3524	3600	1990

Braun T.

TC	r	ΣTC	r^2	PY
125	1	125	1	1978
124	2	249	4	1989
78	3	327	9	1986
66	4	393	16	1975
57	5	450	25	1974
57	6	507	36	1990
55	7	562	49	1974
51	8	613	64	1989
43	9	656	81	1992
42	10	698	100	1974
38	11	736	121	1983
37	12	773	144	1995
37	13	810	169	1994
35	14	845	196	1980
35	15	880	225	1999
33	16	913	256	1988
32	17	945	289	1995
31	18	976	324	1975
31	19	1007	361	1995
28	20	1035	400	1977
27	21	1062	441	1973

27	22	1089	484	1988
27	23	1116	529	1987
26	24	1142	576	2000
26	25	1168	625	1994
25	26	1193	676	1973
25	27	1218	729	1972
23	28	1241	784	1978
23	29	1264	841	1973
23	30	1287	900	1994
23	31	1310	961	1987
22	32	1332	1024	1983
22	33	1354	1089	1982
22	34	1376	1156	1980
22	35	1398	1225	1987
21	36	1419	1296	1973
21	37	1440	1369	1973
20	38	1460	1444	1982
20	39	1480	1521	1982

Small H.

TC	r	ΣTC	r^2	PY
305	1	305	1	1973
239	2	544	4	1974
127	3	671	9	1978
109	4	780	16	1974
86	5	866	25	1977
80	6	946	36	1985
77	7	1023	49	1985
75	8	1098	64	1985
67	9	1165	81	1999
49	10	1214	100	1979
44	11	1258	121	1980
36	12	1294	144	1980
26	13	1320	169	1981
26	14	1346	196	1986
25	15	1371	225	1976
22	16	1393	256	1997
22	17	1415	289	1993
18	18	1433	324	1974
18	19	1451	361	1994
15	20	1466	400	1999
12	21	1478	441	1986
10	22	1488	484	1989
9	23	1497	529	1975
8	24	1505	576	1998
8	25	1513	625	1987

TC	r	ΣTC	r²	PY
7	26	1520	676	1989
6	27	1526	729	1998
5	28	1531	784	1977
5	29	1536	841	1974
5	30	1541	900	1999
3	31	1544	961	1979
3	32	1547	1024	1995
2	33	1549	1089	1975
2	34	1551	1156	2004
2	35	1553	1225	2003
1	36	1554	1296	1973
1	37	1555	1369	2004
1	38	1556	1444	1997
1	39	1557	1521	1996
1	40	1558	1600	1992

Van Raan A.F.J.

TC	r	ΣTC	r²	PY
108	1	108	1	1985
51	2	159	4	1996
49	3	208	9	1991
41	4	249	16	1985
35	5	284	25	1991
32	6	316	36	1973
31	7	347	49	1990
30	8	377	64	1990
25	9	402	81	1993
25	10	427	100	1974
23	11	450	121	1995
22	12	472	144	1998
22	13	494	169	1997
21	14	515	196	2000
20	15	535	225	2001
19	16	554	256	1998
19	17	573	289	1998
19	18	592	324	1994
19	19	611	361	1994
18	20	629	400	1998
18	21	647	441	1993
17	22	664	484	1993
17	23	681	529	1985
17	24	698	576	1980
15	25	713	625	1993
14	26	727	676	2001
14	27	741	729	1994
14	28	755	784	1991

Martin B.

TC	r	ΣTC	r^2	PY
156	1	156	1	1983
74	2	230	4	1997
52	3	282	9	1985
38	4	320	16	1983
35	5	355	25	2001
33	6	388	36	1987
33	7	421	49	1985
30	8	451	64	1995
29	9	480	81	1996
28	10	508	100	1984
24	11	532	121	1988
23	12	555	144	1981
22	13	577	169	1999
20	14	597	196	1984
19	15	616	225	1985
18	16	634	256	1986
16	17	650	289	1996
16	18	666	324	1986
16	19	682	361	1985
16	20	698	400	1984
14	21	712	441	1991
14	22	726	484	1984
11	23	737	529	1986
9	24	746	576	1994
9	25	755	625	1989
9	26	764	676	1987
6	27	770	729	1982
4	28	774	784	1992

Narin F.

TC	r	ΣTC	r^2	PY
112	1	112	1	1997
95	2	207	4	1987
86	3	293	9	1976
82	4	375	16	1976
73	5	448	25	1977
71	6	519	36	1991
70	7	589	49	1972
63	8	652	64	1985
59	9	711	81	1992

55	10	766	100	1978
55	11	821	121	1973
53	12	874	144	1975
52	13	926	169	1991
52	14	978	196	1981
44	15	1022	225	1977
41	16	1063	256	1980
38	17	1101	289	2000
37	18	1138	324	1980
35	19	1173	361	1999
33	20	1206	400	1989
33	21	1239	441	1987
29	22	1268	484	1994
28	23	1296	529	1996
28	24	1324	576	1977
28	25	1352	625	1976
27	26	1379	676	1984
27	27	1406	729	1983
26	28	1432	784	1988
24	29	1456	841	1988
23	30	1479	900	1995
20	31	1499	961	1998
19	32	1518	1024	1994
18	33	1536	1089	1980
18	34	1554	1156	1979
17	35	1571	1225	1978
14	36	1585	1296	1996
13	37	1598	1369	1983
12	38	1610	1444	1986
10	39	1620	1521	1977
10	40	1630	1600	1972
9	41	1639	1681	1983

Schubert A.

TC	r	ΣTC	r^2	PY
124	1	124	1	1989
90	2	214	4	2002
78	3	292	9	1986
59	4	351	16	1978
57	5	408	25	1990
40	6	448	36	1979
33	7	481	49	1988
32	8	513	64	1983
27	9	540	81	1988
27	10	567	100	1987
27	11	594	121	1984
26	12	620	144	2000

26	13	646	169	1994
23	14	669	196	1994
23	15	692	225	1987
22	16	714	256	1987
19	17	733	289	1986
18	18	751	324	2000
18	19	769	361	1993
18	20	787	400	1986
18	21	805	441	1984
17	22	822	484	2001
17	23	839	529	1988
17	24	856	576	1982
16	25	872	625	1982
15	26	887	676	2002
14	27	901	729	1993
14	28	915	784	1989
14	29	929	841	1985
13	30	942	900	1992
12	31	954	961	1996

Glänzel W.

TC	r	ΣTC	r^2	PY
124	1	124	1	1989
54	2	178	4	1988
33	3	211	9	1988
32	4	243	16	1995
32	5	275	25	1983
31	6	306	36	1995
28	7	334	49	1995
27	8	361	64	1988
27	9	388	81	1987
27	10	415	100	1984
26	11	441	121	1994
24	12	465	144	2001
23	13	488	169	1994
23	14	511	196	1987
22	15	533	225	2002
22	16	555	256	1987
20	17	575	289	1994
19	18	594	324	1986
18	19	612	361	1994
18	20	630	400	1993
18	21	648	441	1986
18	22	666	484	1984
17	23	683	529	2001
17	24	700	576	1988

16	25	716	625	1999
16	26	732	676	1996
15	27	747	729	1997
15	28	762	784	1996

Moed F.H.

TC	r	ΣTC	r^2	PY
108	1	108	1	1985
56	2	164	4	1995
54	3	218	9	1996
54	4	272	16	1995
49	5	321	25	1991
41	6	362	36	1985
35	7	397	49	1991
31	8	428	64	1990
26	9	454	81	2002
26	10	480	100	1989
24	11	504	121	1996
23	12	527	144	1999
23	13	550	169	1998
22	14	572	196	2002
22	15	594	225	1991
20	16	614	256	2001
20	17	634	289	1999
18	18	652	324	1989
17	19	669	361	1985
15	20	684	400	1999
15	21	699	441	1993
13	22	712	484	1998
13	23	725	529	1993
12	24	737	576	2002
12	25	749	625	1993
9	26	758	676	1999
9	27	767	729	1996
9	28	776	784	1996

Leydesdorff L.

TC	r	ΣTC	r^2	PY
79	1	79	1	2000
32	2	111	4	1998
26	3	137	9	1986
24	4	161	16	1989
23	5	184	25	1990

TC	r	ΣTC	r²	PY
22	6	206	36	1987
19	7	225	49	1989
17	8	242	64	1996
17	9	259	81	1991
16	10	275	100	1997
15	11	290	121	1994
13	12	303	144	1994
13	13	316	169	1993
13	14	329	196	1989
11	15	340	225	2000
11	16	351	256	1993
11	17	362	289	1992
10	18	372	324	1998
10	19	382	361	1997
9	20	391	400	1992

Egghe L.

TC	r	ΣTC	r^2	PY
47	1	47	1	1990
42	2	89	4	1985
37	3	126	9	2000
36	4	162	16	1992
21	5	183	25	1992
18	6	201	36	1991
17	7	218	49	1986
16	8	234	64	1995
16	9	250	81	1988
16	10	266	100	1986
15	11	281	121	1993
13	12	294	144	1996
13	13	307	169	1996
13	14	320	196	1990
13	15	333	225	1988
12	16	345	256	2000
12	17	357	289	1994
12	18	369	324	1988
12	19	381	361	1987
11	20	392	400	2000

Rousseau R.

TC	r	ΣTC	r^2	PY
25	1	25	1	1996

TC	r	ΣTC	r^2	PY
18	2	43	4	2003
18	3	61	9	1991
16	4	77	16	1995
16	5	93	25	1988
15	6	108	36	1987
15	7	123	49	1992
14	8	137	64	1994
13	9	150	81	2002
13	10	163	100	1999
13	11	176	121	1996
13	12	189	144	1996
13	13	202	169	1993
12	14	214	196	2000
12	15	226	225	2000
12	16	238	256	1990

Ingwersen P.

TC	r	ΣTC	r^2	PY
120	1	120	1	1996
93	2	213	4	1998
83	3	296	9	1997
79	4	375	16	1982
52	5	427	25	2001
37	6	464	36	1997
31	7	495	49	1984
29	8	524	64	1997
29	9	553	81	1987
19	10	572	100	2000
17	11	589	121	1984
15	12	604	144	1996
14	13	618	169	1997
10	14	628	196	2001
10	15	638	225	1992
8	16	646	256	1999
7	17	653	289	1999
7	18	660	324	1995
6	19	666	361	2000
6	20	672	400	1993
5	21	677	441	2000
3	22	680	484	2001
3	23	683	529	2000
3	24	686	576	2000
3	25	689	625	1994
3	26	692	676	1994
3	27	695	729	1992

White H.D.

TC	r	ΣTC	r^2	PY
128	1	128	1	1981
106	2	234	4	1998
103	3	337	9	1989
45	4	382	16	1997
37	5	419	25	1982
28	6	447	36	1981
22	7	469	49	1983
21	8	490	64	1987
20	9	510	81	2001
15	10	525	100	1987
14	11	539	121	1986
14	12	553	144	1985
12	13	565	169	2003
12	14	577	196	1996
12	15	589	225	1981
12	16	601	256	1981
11	17	612	289	2003
10	18	622	324	1990
8	19	630	361	1986
6	20	636	400	2001
5	21	641	441	2004
5	22	646	484	1986
5	23	651	529	1984
5	24	656	576	1977
4	25	660	625	2003
4	26	664	676	1986

IV. Conclusions and open problems

In this paper we studied the g-index being an improvement of the h-index. The g-index g is the largest rank (where papers are arranged in decreasing order of the number of citations they received) such that the first g papers have (together) at least g^2 citations. We show that $g \geq h$ and that g always uniquely exists. We present formulae for g in Lotkaian informetrics. We show that

$$g = \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 2}\right)^{\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha}} T^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$$

$$g = \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 2}\right)^{\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha}} h$$

if these values are $\leq T$; otherwise $g = T$.

Here α is the Lotka exponent and T denotes the total number of sources (in the citation application this means the total number of ever cited papers).

We then calculate the h- and g-indexes of the (still active) Price medallists. Different than in Glänzel and Persson (2005) we do not limit the publication period (except for the fact that we do not use papers older than published in 1972 due to the fact that ISI has no data for them) nor do we limit the topic to informetrics, hence the complete careers (up to 1972) of the Price medallists are considered. It is found that the ranked g-index column resembles more the overall feeling of "visibility" or "life time achievement" than does the ranked h-index column.

We leave open the further exploration of the g-index, including the establishment of the g-index in function of time. In Egghe (2006b) we were able to do this for the h-index based on the cumulative n^{nt} citation distribution (see Egghe and Rao (2001)) and in a forthcoming paper we will do the same for the g-index based on a time-dependent Lotkaian theory.

We also leave open the construction of other h- or g-like indexes and the comparison of these new indexes with the h- and g-index. It would also be interesting to work out more practical cases (in other fields) of h- and g-index comparisons. Such case studies can learn a lot on the advantages and/or disadvantages of the h-index and the g-index.

<u>References</u>

Ball P. (2005). Index aims for fair ranking of scientists. Nature 436, 900.

Braun T., Glänzel W. and Schubert A. (2005). A Hirsch-type index for journals. The Scientist 19(22), 8.

Egghe L. (2005). Power Laws in the Information Production Process: Lotkaian Informetrics. Elsevier, Oxford (UK).

Egghe L. (2006a). An improvement of the h-index: the g-index. Preprint.

Egghe L. (2006b). Dynamic h-index: the Hirsch index in function of time. Preprint.

Egghe L. and Rao I.K.R. (2001). Theory of first-citation distributions and applications. Mathematical and Computer Modelling 34(1-2), 81-90.

Egghe L. and Rousseau R. (1990). Introduction to Informetrics. Quantitative Methods in Library, Documentation and Information Science. Elsevier, Amsterdam (the Netherlands).

Egghe L. and Rousseau R. (2006). An informetric model of the Hirsch index. Preprint.

Glänzel W. (2006a). On the opportunities and limitations of the H-index. Science Focus 1, to appear.

Glänzel W. (2006b). On the H-index – A mathematical approach to a new measure of publication activity and citation impact. Scientometrics 67(2), to appear.

Glänzel W. and Persson O. (2005). H-index for Price medallist. ISSI Newsletter 1(4), 15-18.

Hirsch J.E. (2005). An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output. arxiv:physics/0508025.