

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

D.S. Dotson¹

¹ Ohio State University, Columbus

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I think this article starts with a problem that exists (names inappropriately listed as authors) and goes to an extreme of assuming that this is always a problem. Many articles, conference papers, and books/chapters are indeed co-authored, with sometimes multiple people involved. It would be inappropriate for those contributing to the authorship of a manuscript to not be listed just as it's inappropriate to be listed when not involved with the authorship, but in some position of power/influence.

Some thought to consider:

- Provide data and/or evidence from the literature about how prevalent these examples of inappropriate authorship are occurring.
- Some institutions require details of contribution (and percent contribution) rather than simple listing position. There are other models that try to clarify contribution more precisely. Could those be a viable solution?
- More depth about how tenure/promotion works in India would be of benefit, as tenure and promotion can vary widely from country to country (and frankly, often differs between institutions within the same country).
- There seems to be some assumptions made about the ability to write multiple manuscripts and the limits of possibility, but this is not supported by any evidence. Some scholars may be able to be this prolific in some circumstances. Some research may lead to several articles a year (and they may indeed have several items under review at the same time). While it's not likely that they are 100% authorship on all such items, co-authorship (with valid contributions to the writing of the manuscript) can indeed explain high output.
- This paper would be strengthened by including more scholarly content from the literature, including for background.
- This feels more like an outline to a manuscript – much more could be said and much more evidence could be included.

Again, while I agree that you have some valid points about name inclusion on author lists as being problematic, your support for this is sparse and your solution seems extreme – potentially discounting valid collaborations.