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Dear Editor and reviewers of the Scientometrics,

Thank you for the insightful reviews on the submitted manuscript. We have revised our manuscript based on the reviewers’ suggestions. Below is our response to comments in the decision letter. The original feedback from the reviewers is shown in *courier italics* and is indented. Our responses are in “Times New Roman" and are *not* indented. As far as we can tell, we have addressed all the questions and concerns expressed by the reviewers, and we have implemented all the requests within the best of our abilities.

**Editor’s comments**

Comments by the Editor: The paper needs to be completely reorganised and rewritten before it might be re-submitted to Scientometrics.

We have fixed all the typos pointed by reviewers and we tried to clarify with the best of our abilities the parts in which reviewers could not clearly understand. After carefully reviewing the paper we asked to a professional English editor to reviewer our work. We hope our work is in a much better shape for publication now.

**Response to Reviewer 1**

Reviewer #1: In this contribution authors give a very interesting perspective that the h-index of a researcher is usually lower than his or her neighbors' h-index in a co-author network. The authors write a short paper but tell a quite complete story. I recommend Scientometrics to publish this work.  
  
Also, I have a few suggestions for authors.  
  
(1)     The title is very attractive. However, I think the data in this paper cannot answer the question. It is answered by the opinion (or fact) of "high degree nodes tend to be senior researchers that not only form a large number of students but also establish more collaborations and with different groups along their career [1]".

We agree. In our short communication we do not aim at answering that question. Instead, we show a paradox that usually happens when a researcher compares her h-index with her coauthors’s. So, we removed the question from the title as suggested, changing it to “The H-index Paradox: Your Coauthors Have Higher H-index than You”

(2)     Please give more and clear descriptions of the data, especially for the results of the cases. E.g., the statistics of h-index, the related features of network structure and how to deal with the duplication of author name.

To deal with duplication of author name we used algorithm XX, described in the following paper.

We incorporate more numbers in Table XX, related to the conferences considered. Particularly, XX, XX, XX.

We measured the correlation of h-index with a number of other metrics, such as betweeness centrality, XX, XX, etc. This appears in Table XX.

(3)     There might be a positive correlation between h-index and the degree of nodes in the cases that leads to the discovery of current work.

Yes. Given that h-index We even pointed that other metrics correlated with node degree might also show the same sort of paradox relatedrefer to our responses to reviewers next.

**Response to Reviewer 2**

Reviewer #2: I would recommend to reject this paper. It is like a student's term paper. It does not do a good job to explain the research question and objectives as well as conclusion and implications. Additionally, there is no literature support.

It seems that this reviewer has not realized that we had submitted a short  
communication not a full research article. As such, in our short  
communication we do not aim at answering any specific research question.  
Instead, we show a paradox that usually happens when a researcher compares  
her h-index with her coauthors’s.

It is poorly written in English. I did some corrections in the attached file, but it has to be professionally reviewed by someone.

Please, refer to our responses to reviewers next.

There is additional documentation related to this decision letter. To access the file(s), please click the link below. You may also login to the system and click the 'View Attachments' link in the Action column.  
  
<http://scim.edmgr.com/l.asp?i=49873&l=VJUKHYZH>

We reproduced part of the comments made on the manuscript bellow to discuss how exactly we fixed them.

why ‘her’ is the sample just composed of females? Please use his/her

Using she for an unknown referent in formal writing is a contemporary attempt to balance out the perceived sexism of generic he. However, we understand that most English speakers may find generic she to be at least somewhat marked or surprising. Thus, as suggested, we have changed she to he/she and her to him/her along the entire text.

Please revise this sentence I did not get what this sentence says.

Fixed. We rewrote the sentence to make it clear.

Why?

This refers to the use of he/she again. We fixed all of them.

This statement is very powerful with no literature support!!! Can you please support this by a few strong citations as well as discussing those citations to conclude this statement. This whole sentence till the end of cititation [4] seems like the principal “assortativity” in social network literature. Please research this. High assortativity means that high degree nodes more tends to be connected with high degree nodes.

We have added a few more references that describes what is the paradox. The references are strong periodic from sociology, etc. . . .

What does heterogeneity of degree mean? Explain more. In addition, the sentence starting with “Individuals… does tell anything to reader please revise”

It means…. We revised the sentence.

Maybe it should be written “the latter is important because it helps regulate information overwhelming.”

Done.

What is identified paradox mean? It suddenly mentions complex network. WHY?

We are checking a similar paradox in a different network. That’s why we refer to it as the identified paradox. The complex network comes from the reference to the paper XX on Nature scientific reports, that attempts to generalize the paradox to any sort of complex networks.

It has to be revised.

We revised it.

It has to be revised.

We revised it.

Poorly written in English

We revised it and asked our English editor to give a special attention to this part.

The main objective of this study is not clear to reader. What is the research question?

We tried to make it clear by rewriting it as: XX

The conclusion and implications are poorly explained. To be honest, I did not understand what Author says. As far as I know Pagerank is a derivative of eigenvector centrality not e degree.

We revised it.

I did not understand what author proposes here.

We removed proposes for future work to avoid any confusion and we simply resume our findings.

**Email a o editor. Podemos aproveitar texto aqui.**   
  
Thank you very much for promptly informing us about the decision on our  
recent submission to Scientometrics and for the reviewers’ comments.  
  
However, having carefully read the reviewers’ comments we have got  
surprised with the decision of the Editors of rejecting the publication of  
our short communication (6 pages) in Scientometrics. First of all, we have  
received a very positive review from the first reviewer, who has not only  
correctly understood the point we make in our manuscript about the h-index  
paradox, but has also provided us with a couple of comments for improving  
it. Secondly, the rejection seems to be based on the opinion of the second  
reviewer, who has mainly pointed out typos and grammatical errors in our  
manuscript that can be easily fixed either by ourselves or with the help  
of a professional proofreader.  
  
Regarding the technical comments made by the second reviewer, it seems  
that this reviewer has not realized that we had submitted a short  
communication not a full research article. As such, in our short  
communication we do not aim at answering any specific research question.  
Instead, we show a paradox that usually happens when a researcher compares  
her h-index with her coauthors’s. Besides, this reviewer has strongly complained that we have  
not shown any literature support for our findings. On the contrary, the  
h-index paradox is very similar to the friendship paradox that was  
identified by Scott Feld in an article published in the American Journal  
of Sociology in 1991 (see reference [4]). The friendship paradox has also  
been recently addressed by an article published in Scientific Reports, an  
open access journal published by Nature Publishing Group (see reference  
[3]). Thus, we believe that both works provide the required support for  
the idea behind the h-index paradox. Moreover, we have provided clear  
evidence of this paradox based on data from major ACM SIG Conferences  
collected from DBLP (this data was previously used in a study on the  
evolution of scientific communities that we published in the companion  
volume of the 2013 WWW Conference proceedings - see reference [1]).  
  
Finally, it seems that the second reviewer has not understand our  
discussion related to other possible paradoxes that can emerge from  
metrics that are positively correlated with node degree. We mention  
PageRank as an example of one possible metric as it is known to be  
correlated with node degree. However, the reviewer seems to have  
interpreted our example as if we were saying that PageRank is derivative  
of node degree. We can try to make this clear in our text or even remove  
the example to avoid other readers from misunderstanding this point.  
  
In view of the above arguments, we would like to ask you to reconsider the  
decision of rejecting our manuscript and allow us to submit a revised  
version of it for further consideration for publication in Scientometrics  
as a \*short communication\*. Having checked several other short  
communications published in Scientometrics, we believe that ours follows  
the same standard and is likely to receive considerable attention from the  
social network community.  
  
With our best regards,  
  
Alberto Laender  
Professor of Computer Science at UFMG

<http://homepages.dcc.ufmg.br/~laender/>  
  
Fabrício Benevenuto  
Associate Professor of Computer Science at UFMG

<http://homepages.dcc.ufmg.br/~fabricio/>

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for the opportunity you offered for a resubmission of our manuscript. I was wondering if you could tell us how to proceed with this submission. Please find attached our manuscript.

We have fixed all the typos pointed by reviewers and we tried to clarify with the best of our abilities the parts in which reviewers could not clearly understand. After carefully reviewing the paper we asked to a professional English editor to reviewer our work. We hope our work is in a much better shape for publication now.

Regarding the technical comments made by the second reviewer, we emphasize that it seems  
that this reviewer has not realized that we had submitted a short communication not a full research article.

Finally, one suggestion is related to using he/she instead of referring to researchers using the female pronoun. We understand that using she for an unknown referent in formal writing is a contemporary attempt to balance out the perceived sexism of generic he. Our English reviewer suggested keeping it as it is. However, if we would be happy to change it along the entire text if you feel it is necessary.