

year from 1991 to 2000), and the *awake intensity* was 9.25. Again, finding a Prince is not so easy; my vote is for the paper by Bharadwaj and Sethi<sup>8</sup>, which itself was not so highly cited (29 citations), but it shared 13 citations with Swarup *et al.*<sup>7</sup>. As the paper by Bharadwaj and Sethi<sup>8</sup> was published in late 2001, quite likely it was not the real Prince, because seven other (earlier) citations were reported in 2011. The paper by Chengalur and Kanekar<sup>9</sup> is another candidate for the Prince, but out of 21 citations only six were co-citations with the Sleeping Beauty. So, for this paper it is difficult to decide which paper(s) constituted the Prince(s). It is possible that something else constitutes the Prince, for example a conference presentation in which the Sleeping Beauty is rediscovered, but this would be very difficult to detect.

*Sleeping Beauty 3*: Another highly cited *Current Science* paper<sup>10</sup> – with 218 citations, the fourth most highly cited paper in the journal – is a clear Sleeping Beauty. Figure 1c shows its citation history. It was cited twice in the year of publication (1994), but both citations were self-citations; as was a subsequent 1995 citation. The first two non-self-citations appeared in 1996, but then three years followed without any citations. However, in 2000 there were six citations (two of which were self-citations).

This year was the most important in the history of this paper, as the paper by Randic *et al.*<sup>11</sup> became the Prince. This paper is also highly cited, but less so than Nandy's<sup>10</sup>. So, this pair represents a female domination<sup>4</sup> (note that it has nothing to do with the authors' gender; the female domination means that the Sleeping Beauty paper is more cited than the Prince paper, whereas the opposite situation represents the male domination). Noticeably, these two papers have 122 shared citations. No other paper seemed to be the Prince.

The three papers described above<sup>5,7,10</sup> are good examples of Sleeping Beauties, representing delayed recognition. Maybe the Sleeping Beauties in *Current Science* are not as spectacular as the one discussed by van Calster<sup>12</sup>. He described an article by Peirce<sup>13</sup>, whose sleep lasted for almost 120 years, an astonishing result. Yet the *Current Science* Sleeping Beauties, even if not so remarkable, are worth acknowledging, since they prove that the journal publishes papers that are ahead of their time.

1. van Raan A. F. J., *Scientometrics*, 2004, **59**, 467–472.
2. Garfield, E., *Curr. Contents*, 1980, **21**, 5–10.
3. Ohba, N. and Nakao, K., *Scientometrics*, 2012, **93**, 253–264.
4. Braun, T., Glänzel, W. and Schubert, A., *Res. Eval.*, 2010, **19**, 195–202.

5. Chatterjee, A., *Curr. Sci.*, 2000, **78**, 808–817.
6. Liang, Y. C., Lee, H. P., Lim, S. P., Lin, W. Z., Lee, K. H. and Wu, C. G., *J. Sound Vib.*, 2002, **252**, 527–544.
7. Swarup, G., Ananthakrishnan, S., Kapahi, V. K., Rao, A. P., Subrahmanya, C. R. and Kulkarni, V. K., *Curr. Sci.*, 1991, **60**, 95–105.
8. Bharadwaj, S. and Sethi, S. K., *J. Astrophys. Astron.*, 2001, **22**, 293–307.
9. Chengalur, J. N. and Kanekar, N., *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 1999, **302**, L29–L32.
10. Nandy, A., *Curr. Sci.*, 1994, **66**, 309–314.
11. Randic, M., Vracko, M., Nandy, A. and Basak, S. C., *J. Chem. Infor. Comput. Sci.*, 2000, **40**, 1235–1244.
12. van Calster, B., *J. Am. Soc. Inform. Sci. Technol.*, 2012, **63**, 2341–2344.
13. Peirce, C. S., *Science*, 1984, **4**, 453–454.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. I am obliged to Prof. James Hartley, Keele University for editing the language and constructive comments on the manuscript.

MARCIN KOZAK

*Department of Quantitative Methods in Economics,  
University of Information Technology  
and Management in Rzeszow,  
Suchbaskiego 2,  
35-225 Rzeszów, Poland  
e-mail: nyggus@gmail.com*

## Popular article is a neglected intellectual component in Indian science research publication

Instruction ends in the school room, but education ends only with life. The human mind is our fundamental resource on Earth. Compared to scientific papers, popular articles are easily accessible and comprehensible to a wide general audience amongst people from all walks of life. Popular articles are inspirational and give inciting tips and tutorials to young scientific minds with creative implications for the future. 'Juried', 'refereed', or 'peer reviewed' magazine articles with exhaustive bibliography could also spark innovative ideas with new applications of others' research. There had been a temporal mismatch in Indian science education observing system and how education success is measured. Scholarly journal

articles are only based on original research works and reviews. However, to promote scientific awareness among people of the country and their wards, there should be a new imperative for popular article publications in science research institutes to address different intellectual levels in Indian society. I could ponder a publication in *Nature* entitled, 'Effect of aquaculture on world fish supplies in the year 2000' that emphasized growing aquaculture industry to sustain its contribution to world fish supplies must reduce wild fish inputs in feed and adopt more ecologically sound management practices<sup>1</sup>. Which segment of the Indian scientific community did this finding ultimately reach? What percent-

age of students in India have access to read articles published in *Nature*? Popular articles traverse great odds and many cross boundaries acting as the key for illuminated intellectual functioning of the under-resourced. It is a great work to educate a child, in the true and larger sense of the word, than to rule a country. Even in life, by teaching others we teach ourselves. He who opens a school door, closes a prison. Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education.

It is widely expected that India will invest more funds in education and research in science as well as technology in coming 5–10 years to enable the country to move from service economy to knowl-

edge economy. However, while more funds are essential for these advances, a rejuvenation of existing undergraduate and postgraduate science education system together with an integration of teaching with high-quality research is also desperately wanting. The need for better training in science in India is urgent<sup>2</sup>.

All types of outputs like research papers, research reports, popular articles, opinion, radio and television presentations, etc. are to be properly credited for various assessments and promotions in

Indian science agencies. These items contribute at different intellectual levels to different target groups. If papers with high impact factors alone are taken seriously by working scientists and managers, it would accelerate the fall of Indian research. The norm should be 'a paper is worth its contents first'<sup>3</sup>.

1. Naylor, R. L. *et al.*, *Nature*, 2000, **405**, 1017–1029.
2. Lakhotia, S. C., Shasidhar, L. S. and Vale, R., *Curr. Sci.*, 2013, **104**, 163–165.

3. Varkey, M. J., *Curr. Sci.*, 2004, **86**, 500.

C. REGUNATHAN<sup>1,\*</sup>  
M. R. KITTO<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>228 B, East of DVD School,  
Kottar,  
Nagercoil 629 002, India  
<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Marine Science,  
King Abdulaziz University,  
P.O. Box 80207,  
Jeddah 21589, Saudi Arabia  
\*e-mail: oceanbiocare@gmail.com

## Critical review of letters essential to enhance quality and readability

A recent letter published in this journal had a mistake in the identification of a commonly occurring fruit bat of India<sup>1</sup>. But the error has been spotted out quickly and repeatedly by readers<sup>2-4</sup>. The failure to avoid such a simple taxonomic identification mistake of a common fruit bat shows either the ignorance of subject knowledge by the authors or plain oversight to publish in a hurry without even a friendly review. Although the journal's editorial policy states that letters may be reviewed and edited, it has now become crucial that these may need to be critically reviewed by subject experts so that the best write-ups can be selected for publication to address the larger interest of the readership.

The correspondence section includes qualitative, descriptive and preliminary information on subject matters that are at times uninteresting for the readers who crave for scientific knowledge enhancement. As a matter of fact, one of India's

leading scientists bluntly commented on the letters and said, 'Some of them should not be published because they are poor and there is nothing cerebral about them'<sup>5</sup>. Therefore, it is about time for the editors of the journal to decide on accepting only quality letters that deserve the attention of scientists.

There is no doubt that *Current Science* is India's leading multidisciplinary science journal with a wide circulation across the nation therefore it should follow the model of other leading journals such as *Science* and *Nature* when it comes to publishing quality. If the letters submitted to *Current Science* are critically reviewed by subject experts within the editorial board and elsewhere, the quality can certainly be enhanced while avoiding the avoidable mistakes.

Only a few selected letters that address the multidisciplinary science matters quantitatively and logically can be included in the print version of the journal.

Other ordinary letters responding to straightforward issues such as the conservation of fruit bats and importance of sacred groves in villages and towns can be included in an on-line commenting facility that the journal can easily link to the website in the near future.

1. Mahato, A. K. R., Kumar, V. V. and Patel, N., *Curr. Sci.*, 2012, **103**, 354–355.
2. Nathan, P. T., Mahandran, V. and Sripathi, K., *Curr. Sci.*, 2012, **103**, 1142–1143.
3. Mariappan, P. and Balasundaram, C., *Curr. Sci.*, 2012, **104**, 573.
4. Mariappan, P., Raj, S. V. and Balasundaram, C., *Curr. Sci.*, 2012, **104**, 689.
5. Malhotra, R., *Curr. Sci.*, 2011, **100**, 1466–1471.

GOVINDASAMY AGORAMOORTHY

College of Pharmacy and Health Care,  
Tajen University,  
Yanpu, Pingtung 907, Taiwan  
e-mail: agoram@mail.tajen.edu.tw

## Scientific English

In response to Raman's<sup>1</sup> comments on the poor linguistic competency of Indian learners, and my own<sup>2</sup> concerns in this regard in response to Balaram's<sup>3</sup> editorial about the dearth of technical writers, developing the skill of scientific English among the science graduates will be the best solution. Non-literary, scientific English has its own domain with special linguistic features of vocabulary, grammar and style. Scientific English which is not part of English curriculum in India

should either be trained by the enthusiastic and skilled teacher in the subject, running extra mile or it can be started by the quality conscious institutes under the English Specific Purpose (ESP), a branch of English study dealing with specific skills required in specific profession. In these days of publish or perish such a skill is essential.

1. Raman, A., *Curr. Sci.*, 2012, **102**, 1501.

2. Metri, D. M., *Curr. Sci.*, 2008, **95**, 1654.
3. Balaram, P., *Curr. Sci.*, 2008, **94**, 1345–1346.

DHANAPPA M. METRI

Department of English,  
Sangameshwar College,  
Solapur 413 001, India  
e-mail: metri\_dmm@yahoo.com