

Taxonomic vandalism

This is with reference to the article by Ranjeet Daniels¹ regarding the controversy created over the validity of the species *Nyctibatrachus karnatakaensis* by Dinesh *et al.*² as a replacement name for *N. hussaini*. There is no point in raising the issue for an undescribed or unidentified species *N. major* or *N. humayuni* or regarding Daniels' claims for the validity of the species of the missing types/types destroyed, or the descriptions with illustrations only or descriptions of the species without the types having been designated or the repository of the types being a non-recognized entity. Article 16.4.1 of the International Code (1999) clearly mandates that 'every new specific name published after 1999 must be accompanied in the original publication by the explicit fixation of a holotype'.

Collection of additional material after description of *hussaini* is not relevant to the case; such material cannot be considered syntypic. I suppose that one could make a case for selecting a neotype, but it seems to me that *hussaini* is an unavailable name. Dinesh *et al.*² have selected the most reasonable option of describing the species *de novo* with a new name and the types designated and deposited in a recognized repository. These types now deposited by them in ZSI would act as name bearing and valid for *N. karnatakaensis*.

'Taxonomic vandalism' is an inappropriate phrase. In taxonomy such cases are rare but the International Code of Nomenclature has clear-cut guidelines that streamline all such tricky issues. Patience and perseverance are required in going through the volumes. For complete infor-

mation, latest International Code (1999) can be accessed on-line (<http://www.iczn.org/iczn/index.jsp>). The only thing in taxonomy is that you should be clear about your problems and where to look for the solution. Had this been a case published prior to the 1999, the story would have been different.

1. Ranjeet Daniels, R. J., *Curr. Sci.*, 2008, **94**, 158–159.
2. Dinesh, K. P., Radhakrishnan, C., Manjunatha Reddy, A. H. and Gururaja, K. V., *Curr. Sci.*, 2007, **93**, 246–250.

VINOD KHANNA

Zoological Survey of India,
Northern Regional Station,
218, Kaulagarh Road,
Dehra Dun 248 195, India
e-mail: drvkhanna51@gmail.com

Charges of plagiarism

There seems to be no end at the vilification of our research group and efforts to put an end to my career. I want to offer clarifications one last time. I wish Mahadevan had consulted me before he wrote the letter in *Current Science*¹ seriously affecting our reputation. Hema Rangaswami and I submitted an abstract for the 7th ICSM, which was held on 10–14 January 2005 at Puri, Orissa and the organizers of the conference selected her abstract as one of the best, based on her oral presentation. Moreover, she had won an award for her presentation. It was the decision of the organizers to publish the presented data in a Special Issue of *Glycoconjugate Journal (Glyco. J.)* as part of the Proceedings of the 7th ICSM conference. Every scientist knows that data presented in conferences are not any different from those in regular publications. This is the practice in all laboratories. Therefore, there is no surprise that the data appearing in *Glyco. J.* and *JBC* (2004) are not different, although the title, introduction, text, etc. are different,

with some modification in the figures. I even have a prior copyright permission from the *JBC* for publishing the conference data in *Glyco. J.* There seems to be no limit to the harassment I am being subjected to, even though our norms are no different from those of other laboratories. The same group that engineered the withdrawal of our *JBC* (2005) paper has put pressure on the journal, which found it convenient to withdraw the paper in 2007, in the light of the controversy.

I also want to bring to the attention of the scientific community that I have published the data of the withdrawn *JBC* (2005) paper in *Oncology Reports* (2007) for the following reasons. Since the *JBC* (2005) paper was withdrawn, it is treated as unpublished data. The data are already known to my peers and I cannot lose the priority on these important data. I took the decision to send new data from repetitive experiments (scientific content being the same) to *Oncology Reports* and the same was accepted after peer review. I have already seen an e-mail that wants

to examine this paper, since according to the sender of the e-mail, the abstracts in the two papers appear to be substantially the same!

In spite of all the efforts to besmear my group with plagiarism charges by some in the country, I am at least happy that internationally our work is well received and our papers are well cited. In a recent *Nature Reviews Cancer* (2008, **8**, 212) our work is well quoted and our proposed OPN-induced integrin-mediated NIK-MEK-ERK and MEKK1-MKK4-JNK1-dependent AP 1 activation pathway is reproduced as such. I only hope that I will be spared of this agony, so that I can continue my research with peace of mind.

1. Mahadevan, S., *Curr. Sci.*, 2008, **94**, 553.

GOPAL KUNDU

National Centre for Cell Science,
Pune 411 007, India
e-mail: kundu@nccs.res.in