Correspondence

as *MEDLINE*, *PubMed Central*, *Science Citation Index*, *Scopus*, etc. to be considered for promotions.

Inclusion in *Index Copernicus* has been questioned not only by the authors of this editorial but by others too. Many journals indexed in *Index Copernicus* are predatory journals.² Therefore, MCI needs to reconsider this too.

Another important issue is the type of articles. Many journals including *Nature* publish original research as research notes, research letters, short communications, brief communications, and other formats. Hence, not accepting such publications for promotion is unfair. We suggest that all types of articles except letters to the editor should be taken into consideration for the purpose of promotions.

Another important issue is authorship credit. As per the MCI guidelines, publication credit will be given to only the first two authors. The editorial writers rightly point out that this is too restrictive. They add that the first name in a paper is generally associated with the person who did the maximum work and the last name is that of the supervising senior.³ This may be the practice at some centres where the publishing volume is high but at institutions where publishing is less common, the reality is different. The actual work is done by one or two persons but the heads of departments, senior professors, postgraduate teachers, etc. consider it their right to be included as the first or second authors. Junior researchers and postgraduates, who do the actual work, are ignored or their work is hijacked by senior colleagues or academic superiors, who publish the research as their own work as first/second authors. The names of actual workers (postgraduate students/junior teachers) are relegated to an obscure place in the list of authors. This is not only unethical but also demotivating for those who do the actual work. The number of authors on a paper depends upon the complexity of the study and the number of centres involved in the study. In multicentric studies, the contributions of authors listed in the authorship byline is not less than that of the first two authors.⁴ Hence, we agree that credit should be given to all the authors of a paper so that there is no injustice to postgraduate students and junior teachers, and those not listed as the first or second authors.

REFERENCES

- 1 Aggarwal R, Gogtay N, Kumar R, Sahni P. The revised guidelines of the Medical Council of India for academic promotions: Need for a rethink. *Natl Med J Ind* 2016;**29**:1–5.
- 2 Scholarly Open Access. Beall's list of predatory publishers 2016. Available at http://scholarlyoa.com/2016/01/05/bealls-list-of-predatory-publisher-2016/ (accessed on 10 Mar 2016)
- 3 Zbar A, Frank E. Significance of authorship position: An open-ended international assessment. Am J Med Sci 2011;341:106–9.
- 4 Bavdekar SB, Tullu MS. Research publications for academic career advancement: An idea whose time has come. But is this the right way? J Postgrad Med 2016;62:1–3.

Basavraj S. Nagoba dr_bsnagoba@yahoo.com bsnagoba@indiatimes.com Assistant Dean, Research and Development Department of Microbiology

> Milind Davane Department of Microbiology MIMSR Medical College Latur, Maharashtra

Sachin Mumbre Deputy Dean Department of Preventive and Social Medicine Ashwini Rural Medical College Solapur, Maharashtra

Π

We read with interest the editorial by Aggarwal et al.¹ We congratulate the authors for highlighting the various important issues linked with publications. We would like to add the following:

According to the new MCI guidelines, publications in e-journals will not be considered for promotion to higher faculty posts. As rightly pointed out by the authors, this guideline is probably in response to the proliferation of predatory journals. We agree that in many journals one can pay and publish anything to fulfil the requirements of publications for promotion but many quality journals with high impact factors are slowly opting for the e-format. Some examples are the *Journal of Infectious Diseases* and *International Wound Journal*; both these journals with high impact factors have opted for the e-format from 2016. Similarly, many more quality journals are likely to shift to the e-format in the future. Hence, MCI needs to rethink this guideline and allow publications in journals with a high impact factor and indexed in standard indexing systems such