

Review of: "How Do Academicians Publish More Research Papers for Their Promotion and Positions? A Scrutiny of CV"

Alexandru-Ionut Petrisor¹

¹ Ion Mincu University of Architecture and Urbanism

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

When I first read *"How Do Academicians Publish More Research Papers for Their Promotion and Positions? A Scrutiny of CV"*, I wondered how this work should be treated. It looks more like an essay coming out of the author's own frustrations. It cannot be qualified as a scientific article, because of its many shortcomings, mostly methodological. It is clear that the article is not intended for an international audience, but the very general title and abstract suggest that the authors are unaware of the fact that writing for an international audience requires far away more than writing a text in English. The article is local in scope, and due to the methodological errors I have serious doubts that it is representative for India or even for a region of India.

Moreover, I have serious doubts of an ethical nature. First, the author fails to properly reveal his/her identity, hiding his first name behind an initial. I believe that this dishonest practice should cast serious doubts about the work itself; it looks like the author is throwing out some vicious remarks, but is somehow fearing that using the full name - and thus being identified - could have some (negative) consequences. Second, all "data" used in the "research" comes from some curriculum vitae (CV); the perception of a CV is different, but normally (and especially because apparently the CVs analyzed in this study were submitted for promotion in a public institution) no confidential information was revealed. However, using the CVs submitted for a different purpose as entry data, without (at least apparently) requiring any permission raises ethical questions.

As for the article itself, here are the main concerns, in a random order.

1. The article is substantiated by four references, out of which all are Internet websites. Apparently no serious references (e.g., articles from mainstream journals, books and chapters, conference proceedings) were consulted. This substantiation does not meet even the requirements of a school assignment. This is one of the reasons for which this work cannot be considered a scientific article.
2. The poor substantiation is visible by the fact that the author is completely unaware of a systematic way to sustain his/her proof. For example:
 - (a) Pomponi et al. (2019) have investigated, using a somehow similar logic, the review process, looking at the top reviewers. They conclude that there is little credibility in reviewing many papers over a short time, if reviews are carried out consistently (*"unrealistic number of reviews carried out by single individuals"*). Although the authors have employed a scientific approach, they say that their work is not *"a scientific paper"*. If we look at the approach, it is easy to follow it. They state the source of data (Publons), the criteria (top 250 reviewers), the sample size (46,079 reviews analyzed), and,

in general, all methodological details are provided. On the contrary, "*How Do Academicians Publish More Research Papers for Their Promotion and Positions? A Scrutiny of CV*" lacks essential methodological details, making the research impossible to reproduce and its results questionable.

(b) The contribution of authors is defined using the CRediT (Contributor Roles Taxonomy) taxonomy (Brand et al., 2015). Being aware of this system would help the author of "*How Do Academicians Publish More Research Papers for Their Promotion and Positions? A Scrutiny of CV*" understanding what qualifies someone to be listed as author of a publication, and think twice before questioning the scientific output of other researchers.

3. The main shortcoming is of methodological nature. The author is concerned about academics who publish '*More Research Papers*'. Aside from the extremely poor English, incompatible with international article publishing ("more" is used in a comparative sense; more than whom?), "many research papers" needs a clear definition, which is not found in the article. Then, the proof is based on a "*scrutiny of CVs*". Apart from the ethical question, the author needs to explain his/her research approach. How were the CVs obtained? Apparently, they come from promotion seekers. What is the time frame? What were the institutions providing these openings, exploited by the promotion seekers? How many such CVs were assessed? What other variables were assessed in addition to the scientific output (number of papers) - for example, were age or research experiences considered too? With no answers to these crucial questions, the scientific quality of the approach is more than arguable, and the validity of results questionable.

4. The most controversial point is the implication that, if other people published more papers, *It is evident that most of the work (except for a few) is not done by the academicians themselves but by the scholars/researchers*". What triggers this conclusion? Such harsh statement requires a clear proof, which is not provided. This is why, after reading the work, I believe that this is an expression of the author's own frustrations, not sustained by any convincing arguments.

5. Similarly, the order of authors varies across countries and fields. For example, the author of a research grant producing an article can be listed as first or last author in different settings, depending on countries and fields.

6. The sketchy sections dealing with "*Financial Contributors*" and "*Friendly Associations*" are a collection of statements with no proofs substantiating them. For example, what the author calls "*Friendly Associations*" can be easily proved by joint publications, citation networks or stacking. However, the author does not provide any evidence sustaining his/her statements.

7. As mentioned, the article fails to provide any details on the methodology that could help understanding to which level the results can be extrapolated. In any settings, it is entirely inappropriate to generalize the findings to the whole world, as the title and abstract suggest.

In summary, the article "*How Do Academicians Publish More Research Papers for Their Promotion and Positions? A Scrutiny of CV*" is a poor work, lacking any scientific substantiation or approach, and being in fact a collection of venomous statements not sustained by any proof whatsoever, expressing only the author's frustrations. It does not deserve publication in any settings.

References

- Brand A, Allen L, Altman M, Hlava M, Scott J (2015), *Beyond authorship: attribution, contribution, collaboration, and credit*, Learned Publishing 28(2): 151-155. <https://doi.org/10.1087/20150211>
- Pomponi F, D'Amico B, Rye T (2019), *Who Is (Likely) Peer-Reviewing Your Papers? A Partial Insight into the World's Top*



Reviewers, Publications 7(1):15. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications7010015>