

And objective of the study was stated to be – “objective of this study was to identify characteristics associated with severity of disease in 511 confirmed cases of pandemic H1N1 influenza, in various hospitals of Rajkot city of Saurashtra region from two waves of pandemic influenza A (H1N1) – the first wave from September 2009 to March 2010, and second wave from June 2010 to January 2011”. This clearly mentions that data analysis is from two waves reported in different time frames with $n = 511$. The study mentions the characteristics observed for both waves. How can it be a plagiarism or salami publication if the study objectives, patient numbers and findings are different?

In reference to third study published in Lung India mentioned in the letter, we would like to clarify that the objective of the study was – “the clinicoepidemiological characteristics of patients who were hospitalized with 2009 influenza A (H1N1) infection in Saurashtra region”. We have not tried any comparison, which we have presented in the first study though the data set was same. It is very clear from the objective that we have analyzed only the clinicoepidemiological characteristics of all patients admitted ($n = 274$) during the first wave and so how can it be a plagiarism or salami publication?

We are thankful to author (s) of the letter submitted for reading our articles with such an interest, but we cannot accept that it is a type of plagiarism or salami publication considering the above explanations. From one article, we show various facets of an issue to better understand the disease condition and in other the severity of the disease. Scientific articles in the journal have a limit to show all details of data set, and it may require another publication to show another detail from the same data set.

Author’s Reply

Sir,

In reference to first study published in Indian Journal of Critical Care Medicine mentioned in the letter, we would like to state that the objective of the study were very clear – “Factors associated with severe disease were determined by comparing with nonsevere cases”. Considering the objective of the study, we have described the findings as those have severe disease and those who do not having severe disease and we have not made manipulation in the presentation of the data. The whole data were presented for the first wave ($n = 274$) with its distribution and description as per the objective.

In reference to the second study published in the Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care mentioned in the letter, we would like to clarify that the title indicated comparison of two waves of the epidemic. – “Characteristics of hospitalized patients with severe and nonsevere pandemic influenza A (H1N1) in Saurashtra region, India (two waves analysis)”.

**Rajesh K. Chudasama, Pramod B. Verma,
Chikitsa D. Amin, Bharat Gohel,
Dinkar Savariya, Rakesh Ninama**

Department of Community Medicine, Government Medical College,
Rajkot, Gujarat, India

Correspondence:

Dr. Rajesh K. Chudasama, Vandana Embroidary, Mato Shree Complex,
Sardar Nagar Main Road, Rajkot - 360 001, Gujarat, India.
E-mail: dranakonda@yahoo.com, dranakonda@gmail.com

Access this article online	
<p>Quick Response Code:</p> 	<p>Website: www.ijccm.org</p>