

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

Alexander Schniedermann¹

¹ German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article "How Do Academicians Publish More Research Papers for Their Promotion and Positions? A Scrutiny of CV" is an opinion piece and policy advice about how the Indian science system should reward authorship. Its arguments are based on the observation that there are many malpractices regarding authorship in the Indian community. Many authorships do not represent an actual contribution to the manuscript but are granted for unjustified reasons. The author suggests to strengthen the recognition for activities unrelated to publishing, e.g. mentoring, supervising and guidance, while, at the same time, stop recognizing second authorships for promotions.

In general, the text provides a straightforward line of thought and targets an important problem in contemporary academia. It is most welcome to have observations and perspectives from India as well as scholars engaging in a critical discussion. Unfortunately, the manuscript at hand is only of minor value to the overall discourse.

- First, observations of malpractices have been provided very brief and with no sensitivity to the complexity of the topic. From this background, the suggestion to not consider second authorships as contributions to the publications is highly problematic. To support such a drastic decision, solid proofs are required how the greater majority of second authors did not contribute to manuscripts. It is highly unlikely that such proofs exists or are even possible. In a related manner, the manuscripts it lacks in sources and references for some of its arguments.
- Second, neither the observations nore the recommendations provide a novel contribution to the discourse.
- Third, due to the writing and the use of concepts, the text is sometimes unclear and sounds very subjective.

To improve the manuscript, the author should consider the following points.

- First, it should made clear from the beginning about which context the observations are about. Right from the beginning, it should become clear that the text is about India. It should also be made clear which scinetific discipline/field is meant and whether it is about universities, research institutes etc.. At best, the short text provides 4-5 sentences about the basic configuration about India's science system. Relatedly, it should be clarified what is meant by "academicians" in relation to "academics". In the western world, academicians are members of academic societies/associations. Is this meant here as well?
- Second, the manuscript should feature some references and empirical sources for its claims/observations, especially in section 3 and 4. There are many studies in the field of scientometrics about the issues discussed in the text. For example, studies about the journal dealy times <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2013.09.001> . Relatedly, online sources

should be provided as standardized references, rather than solely as url. For instance, the reference to "Tress Academic, 2021" already results in a 404.