cal studies should be stopped! The editor accepted the revised manuscript on the day of its receipt without reverting to the reviewer. The paper appeared in *Experimental Cell Research* in 1974.

As another example of generous discretion by the editor of a journal, I remember reading a personal incident recorded by Curt Stern, a leading *Drosophila* and human geneticist of the pre-molecular biology era, in an article he wrote on the raging controversy between R. B. Goldschmidt and H. J. Muller and other 'natural selectionists'. Goldschmidt had strong difference of opinion with Muller, which reflected in his Presidential address entitled 'Two philosophies of genetics' at the 1956 Genetics Congress. Stern submitted one of his papers to a journal edited by Goldschmidt and criticized Goldschmidt's views while interpreting his own results. As Stern reminisced, Goldschmidt wrote back after reviewing the manuscript that Stern had read his paper, but rejected Goldschmidt's views without understanding, while he (Goldschmidt) read Stern's manuscript, understood it and rejected Stern's interpretation. The significant point, however, was the decision made by Goldschmidt as the editor, to allow Stern's paper to appear in the next issue. Stern, in spite of his disagreement with Goldschmidt's views on 'philosophies of genetics', admired him for this 'greatness'.

These instances reflect the positive roles that reviewers and editors can play in promoting scientific progress. A constructive criticism is always helpful in improving the quality. When combined with some out-of-the-way help, as experienced in my own case, it can become a turning point in a young author's career. The editor, being a scientist, should be able to take a balanced and informed view, remembering that only the author/s is/are responsible for interpretations offered in the paper and posterity alone can decide on their validity or otherwise.

The contemporary experiences with the review and editorial decisions are, unfortunately, different from my past experiences. Today, it appears that the main responsibility of reviewers and editors is to find the slightest pretext on which a paper may be rejected. Nowadays editors of most journals seem to be only sending the reviewers' comments and authors' replies to each other, without even reading what the two parties are actually stating. This may be a consequence of the exponential increase in the number of manuscripts being submitted to a journal, most requiring rejection rather than acceptance. With rejection having become the primary goal, the possibility of a reviewer extending a 'helping hand' becomes remote.

A basic tenet of progress in science is that as we move along, we shed or modify the current hypothesis/theories. However, the current trend in the reviewing process is that new findings should be in conformity with the current trends/dogmas. 'Junk DNA' is a typical example of the conformist approach. The 'non-coding' RNA/genome, which has become an extremely fast-proliferating theme in recent years, remained as 'junk' for several decades because the so called 'central dogma of molecular biology' had no place for its function, in spite of the fact that the non-coding part is always a major component of the eukaryotic genome! During the 1980s and 1990s reviewers, editors and granting authorities snubbed or even 'killed' attempts to look for functional significance of the so called 'junk' DNA. Obviously, reviewers, editors and other decision-makers exceeded their briefs.

A reviewer taking the trouble of retyping an entire manuscript is obviously a rare event. The editor taking a more proactive role in accepting a manuscript for publication, even if not agreeing to the views of the author/s also seems to have more or less disappeared in today's fast-paced publication process. This needs to change. Peer reviewers must remember that they are also authors. The authors must believe their findings and should not become unduly compliant with the reviewers' observations. The editors should make good use of their own wisdom and give the authors some freedom of interpretation, as long as the reported work is technically sound. We must remember that our understanding of nature progresses only when the new information lets us know what we still do not know.

1. Gupta, M. N., *Curr. Sci.*, 2013, **105**, 159–161.

SUBHASH C. LAKHOTIA

Cytogenetics Laboratory,
Department of Zoology,
Banaras Hindu University,
Varanasi 221 005, India
e-mail: lakhotia@bhu.ac.in

Open access: publish with caution

The internet and electronic publishing have changed the scholarly communication, where it both complements and challenges the traditional systems. It has greatly accelerated the speed of publishing, increased the overall distribution and number of global audiences and has made it possible to think of new publishing systems like open access (OA) system, where, generally, authors pay for peer review, editing and website maintenance. However, the major challenge remains quality of publication through the OA system.

Publishers are increasingly opting for an OA route and it is perhaps becoming more popular and diverse. It does include traditional publishers like Springer (Germany), which now publishes about 300 OA titles and a larger number of new powerhouses[1]. However, there are some serious concerns which researchers need to keep in mind while opting for OA publishing scheme. There are a number of predatory publishers, who are spying on researchers and trying to motivate them to publish in their journals[2]. These journals are fraudulent and work just for money[2,3]. Jeffrey Beall, a Scholarly Initiatives Librarian at the University of Colorado Denver, USA, discusses this significant problem in one of his articles published in *Nature*[2] and on his blog

(http://scholarlyoa.com/publishers/), which monitor these publishers.

Beall's journey to this world of predatory publishers started when he received a number of e-mails from new journals, asking him to submit articles or join their editorial boards, as is probably a routine nowadays with most of the researchers. He was suspicious about these journals, because most of the e-mails contained numerous grammatical errors[2,3] and a little research spilled the beans about their origin. He was curious to find out more about this new publishing business and thus became the watchdog for what he describes as 'potential, possible or probable predatory scholarly open-access publishers', listing and scrutinizing them on his blog[2,3]. His efforts are helpful for the whole research community and therefore, his blog is followed by most of the libraries and researchers throughout the world[3].

Thus, it is clear that the OA practice is misused by a number of predatory publishers who exploit the whole process to make money by publishing anything, without following the standard procedures[2–4]. This is dangerous for the research community and thus, concrete efforts are required from the authors to make sure that they are not caught in this practice. However, there are some authors who deliberately indulge in such practice by taking unethical shortcuts to publish low standard work, which is mostly plagiarized[2]. Thus, a rigorous system is required to check such practices in research.

1. Enserink, M., *Science*, 2012, **338**, 1018.
2. Beall, J., *Nature*, 2012, **489**, 179.
3. Butle, D., *Nature*, 2013, **495**, 433–435.
4. O'Hara, B., *Guardian*, 26 October 2013, pp. 1–6; http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/grrlscientist/2012/oct/26/2

A. A. SHAH

Department of Applied Geology,
Curtin University, Sarawak,
Miri 98009, Malaysia
e-mail: afroz.shah@curtin.edu.my

Where do Indian neuroscientists publish their best research?

In these pages it has been reported that Indian chemists[1], and researchers in general[2], tend to publish their 'best work' in foreign journals. The share of 'best' work between international journals and Indian national journals is best computed using an exergy parameter introduced recently[3]. Exergy, *X*, is the second-order energy-like term obtained from the product of impact ($i = C/P$, which is a quality term) and citations *C* (a term that has both quality and quantity attributes) and is

Table 1. In exergy terms, international journals took the lion's share of 'best' Indian research in neuroscience from 1992 to 2005

Journal	Country	Papers *P*	Citations *C*	Impact *i*	Journal-wise exergy *X*	Country-wise exergy *X*	International versus Indian exergy *X*	Percentage share of exergy
Acta Neurochirurgica	Austria	45	249	5.53	1377.80	1377.80		
Acta Neurologica Scandinavica	Denmark	66	308	4.67	1437.33	1437.33		
Neuroradiology	Germany	44	228	5.18	1181.45	3428.65		
Psychopharmacology		20	212	10.60	2247.20			
Neuroscience Letters	Ireland	71	260	3.66	952.11	952.11		
Brain Research	The	89	734	8.25	6053.44			
Journal of Neurological Sciences	Netherlands	244	493	2.02	996.10	8286.24		
European Journal of Pharmacology		36	211	5.86	1236.69			
British Journal of Neurosurgery	UK	150	539	3.59	1936.81			
Journal of Neurochemistry		277	384	1.39	532.33	3373.29		
Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry		58	229	3.95	904.16		64273.80	98.74
Neurology	USA	29	415	14.31	5938.79			
Nature Genetics		5	323	64.60	20865.80			
Journal of Neurosurgery		82	311	3.79	1179.52			
Neurosurgery		36	310	8.61	2669.44			
American Journal of Neuroradiology		37	260	7.03	1827.03	45418.37		
Brain Research Bulletin		34	257	7.56	1942.62			
Epilepsia		165	235	1.42	334.70			
Neuron		6	233	38.83	9048.17			
Surgical Neurology		91	229	2.52	576.27			
IEEE Transactions on Neural Network		48	223	4.65	1036.02			
Neurology India	India	1285	475	0.37	175.58			
Indian Journal of Experimental Biology		460	342	0.74	254.27	820.53	820.53	1.26
Indian Journal of Medical Research		160	226	1.41	319.23			
Journal of Association for Physicians in India		696	223	0.32	71.45			