

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

J.-E. Velasco-López<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad Complutense de Madrid

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Agree in double nature of the issue that should be considered both ethics (who signs?) and pragmatism (in what order?) in the title of the paper. Interesting topic and would consider the following suggestions:

1.- Check The Committee on Publication Ethics, made up of leading scientific publishers from around the worldà considering the ethics of publication according to COPE we will also be considering whether our work as authors deserves to be published. In one of its guidelines (<http://publicationethics.org/files/u2/2003pdf12.pdf>), the COPE is very clear when it comes to indicating who can be considered the author of a scientific article:

“Authorship credit should be based only on: (1) substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; (2) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and (3) final approval of the version to be published.”

These rules serve both as criteria to justify inclusion and to prevent exclusion: they serve to prevent false authors from slipping through and to prevent real authors from being left out. In short, this is what they want to prevent: Ghost authors, Guest authors and a moral hazard.

2.- From another point of view, the COPE standards consider that, since an article is the report of research, there are two dimensions to consider in the contributions to an article: The research((1) in the design of the research, (2) in the acquisition of data, (3) in the analysis and interpretation of the data) and the article itself ((4) in the manuscript of the article or (5) in the critical revision of the article in intellectually important aspects). From here, the COPEs tell us that substantial or critical contributions are needed in either of the two dimensions. Moreover, it is not enough to contribute to one of the two dimensions, it must consist of a contribution to both: research + article.

3.- Check CRediT (<https://casrai.org/credit/>): a taxonomy to articulate the contributions of each autor. In recent years, following the initiative of a group of scientists (Brand et al. 2015), a taxonomy has been developed to declare the roles of researchers who are either authors or acknowledgements in a scientific article:

“ An individual contributor may be assigned multiple roles, and a given role may be assigned to multiple contributors. When there are multiple people serving in the same role, a degree of contribution may optionally be specified as ‘lead’, ‘equal’, or ‘supporting’. It is recommended that corresponding authors assume responsibility for role assignment, and that all contributors be given the opportunity to review and confirm assigned roles”

4.- Consider Co-authorship in scientific articles as an indicator of success: reasons that are often pointed out for multiple authorship are that it correlates very well with different indicators of success. The most productive authors tend to publish in co-authorship. Multi-authored articles tend to receive more citations.

5.- More discussion and conclusions in the article would be welcome. Also not many references.