

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

Yuki Yamada¹

¹ Kyushu University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article focuses on publication-related issues encompassed by the evaluation system for academicians in India, specifically introducing some aspects of authorship and offering recommendations for future improvements. Although the manuscript is written in a very concise manner, the topic itself it addresses is of great significance in embodying in writing what many academics share in common, and I enjoyed reading it myself. It seems to be related to the Matthew effect, in which the rich get richer, and I think this debate needs to continue to be actively undertaken in the future. On the other hand, when evaluating the paper as an article, the lack of clarity and the lack of evidence due to the brevity of the explanations are important concerns. I have added my comments for each section below. I hope this will be of some help to the author.

1. Background.

- First of all, I think it is important to clarify to some extent which academic field is being discussed here. I don't think the discussion here is applicable to researchers in the humanities and social sciences.

- Definitions of "academicians" and "scholars/researchers" are needed. It seems that these are treated as separate categories in the text, but it is not clear what they are.

- "The author reviewed numerous curriculum vitae of associate professors, professors, principals, Deans, registrars, and Vice-chancellors." Please give us the details of this survey. Otherwise, I cannot examine the appropriateness of the sentences that follow. In particular, the point that even associate professors had "at least 300" papers is very hard to believe based on ordinary practice.

2. Order of Authorship

- "However, with the introduction of the University Grants Commission (UGC) regulations in 2009, which require the scholars' names to be listed first when submitting the thesis in any Indian University, the situation has changed. Now, the name of the research supervisor can be placed as the second author." I could not catch what the author was trying to say in this part. It is unclear why the research supervisor "can" be the second author if the scholars' names are written in the first author's position (maybe in their journal papers) when submitting the thesis. It is always possible. Also, I don't understand why this led to the subsequent abuse of the system. I think the lack of description is probably the main reason why there is so much confusion here. Please write more carefully how the situation changed to what kind of situation.

- "However, it is evident that most of the work (except for a few) is not done by the academicians themselves but by the scholars/researchers (Tress Academic, 2021)." This seems to be an issue of real contribution, gift authorship, or contributorship. In recent years, researchers have often used CRediT to manage their contributions, but is there fraud going on here?

3. Financial Contributors

- Since the discussion of authorship seems to continue here, it does not seem appropriate to make it a stand-alone section due to its lack of independent content. Besides, it would be better to discuss authorship issues in the context of ICMJE and COPE authorship standards, for example.

- This section simply presents the current situation (perhaps the italicized part corresponds to that?), so please discuss properly why that is a problem.

- This section does not present any evidence at all, so please discuss it with evidential support.

4. Friendly Associations

The same is true here. Please provide evidence and discuss the issue with careful attention to what the problem is and whether it is actually a problem. For example, is the part "With the support of these friendly associations, academicians are able to publish a high number of publications. Consequently, without putting in significant personal efforts, academicians in colleges and Indian Universities can produce an extensive list of publications" really true? In other words, are they really doing it without effort? Also, because they are assigned additional tasks that researchers who are not doing work related to journal management are not doing, one can assume that the extra effort is incurred by them. If not, we need some evidence to show that they are not. Perhaps implicitly, the "effort" here means that it is spent on the publication of papers. If so, it should be explicitly stated.

5. Necessary Academic Reforms

I agree with some of the recommendations here. However, I disagree with the idea that only the first author's paper should be evaluated, or that only the student's name should be listed in the supervised student's work, as this is significantly different from the current standard approach to authorship. This could lead to deeper problems such as gift authorship, ghost authorship, and plagiarism of research. It could also destroy many collaborations and adversely affect the promotion of science.