UGC notification on journal lists to calculate API scores

The University Grants Commission (UGC), New Delhi has announced that it will notify the names of journals to be considered for the calculation of API scores for Appendix-III of its Regulations¹. Accordingly, the universities concerned shall identify the subject-wise journals through Subject Expert Committees and forward the recommendations to UGC in the prescribed format². The UGC Standing Committee will subsequently scrutinize and notify the list, which will be applicable to all universities. In other words UGC has *suo moto* assumed the responsibility of certifying the quality of journals

We consider the whole exercise unproductive as preparing such lists is timeconsuming, which will unnecessarily delay the recruitment process A heftly prepared list will be un-exhaustive, bias and full of repetition that will aggravate the problem further. The reasons are apparent – publication of journals is a dynamic and continuous process; each year new journals are added and a few old ones may be either omitted and/or renamed. The timely updating of lists and subsequent approval will be tedious. No national or international database contains all journals; in fact, each has its own limitations. Modern research is more interdisciplinary in nature. Chances are quite high, especially in non-science disciplines, that lists prepared by various departments of universities may miss the interdisciplinary journals, which are of high quality. Therefore, applicants having papers in these journals are likely at a disadvantage.

Our experience with the API system suggests that UGC rules often lack clarity, allowing individual institutions to have their own interpretations. We explain our point with two examples. First, awarding of marks amongst authors of an

augmented augmented value of 20 marks has publication¹. Suppose a paper with total augmented value of 20 has been written by 2 lead authors (according to guidelines, both qualify for 70% of the total augmented value of the paper) and 2 satellite authors (30% of the total augmented value). Majority of universities award 70% of augmented value (i.e. 14 marks) to each of the lead authors, while the remaining (satellite authors) will have six marks each. Surprisingly, certain universities have their own way of interpreting this; rather than sharing, they divide the augmented values amongst the authors. Therefore, in the above example, lead authors will get seven marks each, while satellite authors will get three marks each. In this case also, the lack of clarity will allow universities to interpret the rules in their own ways. Also, what will happen to publications in journals that have not been enlisted?

Secondly, there are many old, good quality journals published by prestigious academic bodies with old volumes/issues not having ISSN numbers (we strongly believe that ISSN number does not reflect the quality of work published in a journal), which were received subsequently. Thus applicants with publications in such old volumes (without ISSN numbers) are also at a disadvantage.

Therefore, the attempt by UGC to enlist journals is likely to meet limited success. Nevertheless, certain steps need to be taken to minimize the damage arising out of the UGC directive. For example, a publisher-wise list should be prepared alongside and approved. The Screening Committee must be empowered to decide on the quality of journals, not arbitrarily, rather based on clear and verifiable criteria documented in the report of the committee. Academies such as the National Academy of Agricultural Sciences, India pre-

pare their own list of journals. Similar ratings developed by relevant national (management, commerce, social science, etc.) academies/international rating agencies should be accepted as such. Though controversial, in science and other disciplines where a large number of impact factor journals are available, only these must be accepted. However, non-impact factor journals listed in ratings prepared by the national science academies should be treated as indexed and marks should be awarded accordingly. In case of journals that previously did not have ISSN number, the subsequent new ISSN number allotted must be accepted for old issues. Lists prepared subject-wise must be mutually inclusive; journals figuring in any list must be taken into account, and marks should be awarded accordingly.

- UGC, Minimum qualifications for appointment of teachers and other academic staff in universities and colleges and measures for the maintenance of standards in higher education, 4th Amendment, Regulations. 2016.
- 2. UGC, DO No. F. 1-112016 (Secy) dated 8 August 2016.

VIJAY PARAMANIK^{1,*} MANOJ KUMAR RAI² NAVEEN K. SHARMA³

¹Department of Zoology, and ³Department of Botany, Indira Gandhi National Tribal University, Amarkantak 484 887, India ²Department of Peace Studies, School of Culture, Mahatma Gandhi Antarrashtriya Hindi Vishwavidyalaya, Wardha 442 005, India *e-mail: vijayparamanik@gmail.com

Obligations behind quantum internet dream

Quantum internet is envisaged to fulfil the long-cherished dream of teleportation of quantum information (qubits) be it locally, globally or in intergalactic regions¹. However, the problem behind achieving this goal lies in the current approaches of research and infrastructural implications around the world.

A few actions are necessary to fulfil this dream in the near future. First, from the perspective of both computer and electrical science, it is of utmost importance to acquire knowledge and techniques to build an innovative qubits storage device (i.e. solid-state quantum memory) and processing nodes, where

appropriate shielding mechanisms may be incorporated to eliminate unwanted and noisy interactions with the environment. Secondly, interdisciplinary approaches should be previewed for efficient development of an interface between quantum memory and quantum processors to entangle with the qubits for