**‘Evaluation of research – Are we doing it right in India?’ by M. Madan et al.**

**General comment:**

I have one criticism --- very specific in the context of medical science and its research.  
References to medicine in the paper occur sporadically only.  
For IJME readers I would expect 90% focus on medicine and allied disciplines.

**Specific comments:**

ll. 6—27. Excellent. However I have remark on the term ‘misuse’ in ll. 23 and 26. To me ‘abuse’ also occurs. I understand that ‘abuse’ is a more intense term than ‘misuse’. Nonetheless I believe that people tend to abuse such metrics for their petty advancements in career.

l. 28. You mean ‘this study’ and not ‘the study’?

ll.29—30. I believe the word string ‘how not to use them’ should be changed to either ‘how these cannot be used’ or ‘how these should not be used’. The latter string to me is more emphatic and relays your intent more firmly.

ll. 31—34. Articulate idea. ‘data infrastructure’ appears a bit wordy; how about saying ‘datasets’ or simply ‘data’? If the term ‘data infrastructure’ vitally necessary, then that term needs to be explained in plain English. Also better would be to clarify ‘evaluation’: self or by another agency, person?

l. 36. Is ‘give’ here not too simplistic? How about using ‘to bestow upon’ or similar more impactful term? I think it would be helpful to briefly explain the term ‘undue’ used here. A couple of examples would be helpful.

l. 37. In ‘award—reward’ system, separate the words using an ‘en’ dash and not using a hyphen.

l. 39. ‘allocating’ sounds inappropriate here. ‘allocate’ would mean an automatic grant giving process: e.g., an annual budget allocation to a department of an institution. In the present context you are referring to winning a grant through competitive process (at least in principle). Hence ‘giving’ or ‘granting’ (I realize it is tautological to say granting a grant) could mean better. I loathe the use of ‘etc.’ in scientific writing. It is a useless term which means nothing to an attentive reader. I suggest that you either delete this term or list all the items meant here. Does ‘unwittingly’ fit in this context? I do not think so. I think it is more due to the ‘ignorance’ of the non-science bureaucrats (e.g., IAS ‘bosses’, who have no clue of science, who may have trained in history or languages and aged scientists sitting as bureaucrats). Consider changing the term ‘unwittingly’.

ll. 42—46. Impressive.

l. 47. Could this not be a more personalized by saying, ‘let us consider the 860 articles and reviews published in *Nature* in 2013 for example’? I think such would be more powerful.

l. 48. ‘as seen from’ --- ‘as evident in’? No space required after the numeral and the symbol (%).

l. 50. Use of ‘merely appears unnecessary.

l. 51. This is a far-too-generalized compliment to *Nature* (N) and *Science* (S). I have seen and read several papers (several would mean 100s) which have never cited any paper from these two journals. They are popular, I agree. But I would refrain from offering such sweeping compliment to N and S.

l. 52. The sentence fragment used here appears redundant to me given that datasets are supplied in the following fragments. Remove this fragment and re-word the following section appropriately to relay the message said here.

l. 56. I think ‘citations of’ reads better than ‘citations to’.

l. 57. Change ‘during 2006—2013’ to ‘in 2006—2013’ and replace the hyphen with an ‘en’ dash.

l. 58. I imagine ‘fields’ here implies a plurality involving more than two. If that is right, then would it not be appropriate to say ‘among’?

l. 59. Capitalize N in ‘nanoscience’ in alignment with the remainder. ‘yet’ necessary here?

l. 61. The first segment of this line (‘Another index …’) reads clumsily. Please restring it to relay the meaning better.

l. 63—65. I liked the use of ‘she’ and ‘her’ here, whereas by and large people (more so in India) use he and her rather consistently. However in line with the global style of writing I think these terms need to be changed to ‘he/she’, ‘his/her’ building neutrality. In l. 64, ‘it is usually found’ reads awkwardly. Please change this word string as appropriate.

l. 68. Second ‘the’ superfluous.

l.73. ‘Zare’ here reads awkwardly. Somehow illustrate that this is the name of the author cited as (4).

l. 77. Use of that before a direct quote appears awkward. However I realize that it offers a better meaning in this context and therefore repeat that ahead of the quote in l. 75.

l.78. ‘blunt’ does not make any sense. What is the purpose of using this term? Replace with a more meaningful word.

l. 81--87. I cannot agree more. However a word of caution here. What is implied here is true only in the context of the so-called big institutions (both teaching and research), but not true of the ‘smaller’ institutions (both teaching and research). The human power of the so-called institutions has swung toward the other end of the spectrum in choosing to patronize substandard and low quality journals that are run today (especially in India) for only-commercial reasons. I have heard of and known of my innocent friends from rural India have been enticed with hefty publication fees and their unread articles published ruthlessly in cost-effective electronic media journals that hold ISSN numbers!! In summary what I want to say here is that there is an intense level of an ugly polarization especially in India, where some of the elite institutions and their academic staff, who parade themselves as the custodians of Indian science, fit into the context you have spoken about. That is what I agreed with at the start of this paragraph. But at the other end of the spectrum, naïve and innocent people are fleeced to pay hefty charges and their poorly written science is published with no editorial or professional reading before publishing!

l. 88. ‘Eagerness’ is too sober a term. I would think it is greed, simply greed. ‘THE’ and ‘QS’ need explanation.

l. 89. the final fragment ‘ethical considerations’ need better wording to gel with the remainder. Retain the term ‘damned’, which to be is most correct here; appropriate the rest of the words to gel with the remaining text.

ll. 90—91. ‘Indian science’ is briefer and better than what has been said here?

l. 92. Is it difficult to get hold of a more recent report? The cited one appears far too dated.

ll.110--114. Here too I cannot agree more. Incisive comment. But then what strikes me at this point is influential people in India (who wield the power both within science and without) manipulate systems to their advantages. Quite ugly and sometimes even ruthless. I am reminded a joke that went about in India in the 1980s: ‘we have plenty of politics among Indian scientists, whereas no science occurs among the politicians’.

l. 113. I would prefer using ‘instances’ instead of ‘cases’. I know this term is oft-used by many. But to me it sound ill fitting, since I am always reminded of ‘suitcases’ and ‘court cases’.

ll.117—120. Interesting argument. Impressive too. This is how government department manipulate things to their gains and advantages. The politician (the minister) wants to present in the parliament that he (or she) had done well as a minister. But in reality as a genuine tax payer I am keen to know how much the money has been spent fruitfully? I am more worried by the absence of very basic toilet facilities in remote and rural Indian primary schools, where 10—12 year old girl children study and definitely they need some level of privacy. How much of these have been resolved. As much as I know nothing, whereas we are building massive research institutions (of MIT calibre) of fantastic infrastructure. Government hospitals are in such a mess today that private --- business --- hospitals are thriving at an enormous cost to the ordinary people. I am sorry I got waylaid.

Coming back to science funding in India, how much productive science has been done either to build new knowledge or to build technology to improve things? I have no statistics on this matter to reel off the cuff. But my gut feeling is that out of Rs 100 spent on a project probably Re 1 or Rs 2 worth is returned to the people of India. The rest go down the drain improving the lot of the scientist (rather the scientific politician), in enabling him/her to gain accolades in the national and international scenes.

I held the membership in PAC in DST in the 1990s and depressed I resigned. I felt that the money was allotted to useless, badly conceived projects which had no purpose for the Indian people. Unable to accept the ruthless muffling launched on my shouting, I quit in disgust.

ll.127—134. Very true. Will this call be heard aby any one? Do either the administrators or the scientists involved have the patience to listen to your call? I don’t think so.

ll. 137—139. Change the double quote marks to single quote marks.

ll.141—146. Idea is excellent. But I believe that some empirical data to support the statements would add value.

ll.148—163. The summary is acceptable. But I think the conflict of idea needs to be articulated in words.

ll. 170—171. The statement on CSIR is incomplete with no example. Provide 1—2 examples here.

l. 186. Not clear. Needs further dilation and explanation.

l. 195. What does ‘non-refereed (reputed) journal’ mean? I find that use of terms ‘non-refereed’ and ‘reputed’ confusing and even contradictory. ‘… would be augmented’ means what? Is this a suggestion made by you? Or is it a statement of the current scenario? I will read this as a suggestion to improve (used of ‘augment’) and therefore would see the use of ‘should’ as a better option than ‘would’.

ll.199—201. Use of ‘prestigious’ here needs to be rationalized better with appropriate evidences.

ll. 203--204. A short explanation is necessary why such variability exists in fields identified to make better sense to the context spoken about.

l. 211. Replace ‘fortunes’ with either ‘future’ or ‘career’.

l. 226. I do not see any purpose for ‘equally’ in this line.

ll.231—232. I have known of instances where two authors who had contributed equally have been listed by tossing a coin.

l. 233. I cannot believe that papers are there with a 1000 authors. I have seen papers in Nature up to 80—90; but none more than that.

l. 238. Break the sentence and start a new sentence to refer to the outcome of the committee.

l. 241. I think the intended word here is ‘tantamounts’ and not ‘amounts’.

l. 242. Use of ‘its’ is not helpful in understanding the context and purpose.

ll. 243—245. I cannot agree more. I have personally known that many college lecturers seek to this mode of publishing in all-and-sundry journals printed and published by people with no background and experience simply for the sake of page charges (= money).

l. 248. What are ’22 ways’?

ll. 256—267. Valid points. I do not challenge either. But being an article for a professional journal, I believe that emphatic evidences need to be mounted here since strong allegations are made against an internationally recognized indexing service.

ll. 270—271. I think a word or two is missing. Text does not read well.

l. 274. insert ‘the’ before selection.

ll.274—284. Excellent points. I am aware of the quixotism of NAAS, which is awkwardly messy in

this context.

ll.288—290. I applaud your boldness. Kudos.

l. 295. The term ‘such’ in this sentence does not mean clearly.

ll.296—301. Nice to use an example from the UK. But is that OK? Even if that is OK, then I believe a better contextualization is necessary when you bring that example into UGC’s assessment. Something is missing in terms of connectivity.

ll.302—304. Rationalization is not clear here. Explain details better so that the intent becomes clear. I am not sure how much Indian readers would understand the use of ‘salami’ as a metaphor. All the more critically, the segment with ‘scientists’ is messy and does not provide a clear text.

l. 306. Insert ‘has’ between ‘academia’ and ‘led’.

l. 318. I do not see a need for ‘the’ here.

l. 319. Change approaches to options; or change options in 318 to approaches.

ll. 321—323. There is a quotation here. Therefore the author(s) of the quotation need(s) to be said here.

ll.346—347. Commendable remark. I applaud your courage to say this.