

# Review of: "Publish or perish: time for a rethink?"

Ganapathy Krishnan

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

For an India based, pseudo academician in his seventies to be requested to review an article on 'Publish or perish' speaks volumes of the publisher ! Trained in the 20<sup>th</sup> century I often feel like being in the Jurassic Park, though familiar with ChatGPT ! "*There is so much good in the worst of us and so much bad in the best of us that it ill behoves any of us to find fault with the rest of us*". When James Truslow Adams enunciated this concept in the early 19th century he could have been referring to this perennial conundrum of publish or perish which is unlikely to ever have a universally applicable solution. One size does not fit all . Good and evil are two sides of the same coin.

What is relevant to the western academic world is not necessarily applicable to the rest of the planet. While most articles published in high impact indexed journals do contribute immensely to the growth of science, the contrary is not necessarily true. In countries like India , medical practitioners are so overwhelmed with clinical practice, that they just do not have the time or secretarial assistance necessary to document observations and submit a paper , particularly to a journal with uncompromising standards. This author had a personal series of having managed 600 patients with cerebral arterio venous malformations which in 2010 was certainly a large series. However very few publications came out of this. Saving lives immediately took precedence over submitting papers. The new cadre of " Professors of Practice' acknowledges that people who get into the water and are outstanding swimmers are as competent to teach swimming as those who have published scores of papers on the biophysics of swimming, without having dipped in the water. The precedent of " Professors of Practice' started by Cornell University is now followed by globally recognised Higher Institutions of Learning In India. Full time industry experts are proving to be equally good mentors and teachers as those with a high H index

This author having retired from active neurosurgical practice 8 years ago now reviews articles regularly. When one of his well researched papers on eNeurointensive care ( at the height of the pandemic) was rejected the author made a point for point rebuttal and also reviewed the entire process of reviewing. The initially rejected paper was accepted. At the request of the editor an article on reviewing was submitted, peer reviewed and accepted. (**Ganapathy K. Science and Art of Reviewing Papers to Maintain Standards in Academia. Neurol India 69:1547-50.2021**) Acceptance of papers, in the real world, is still subjective. Bias cannot be fully eliminated.

Sangeeta et al need to be complemented on raising this important issue. The truth always hurts. To the Indian psyche culturally for centuries we have always believed that knowledge is to be shared gratis. Yes, times are different. There is no such thing as a free lunch. Indian journals ( with > 50% global contributors ) having Open Access do not impose charges for publication from the contributing authors. . Advertisements, subsidy from the specialist society are used to fund the publication and of course considerable volunteerism from the editorial board. Those of us belonging to the BC era do

sincerely hope that “Pay or Perish” will not be the new phrase in the coming years.