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Me, according to modern metrics

• Prize Societal Impact in 2016
• Organizing transdisciplinary symposia in the hospital
• Teaching RCR in Graduate School and RI course at VU University
• (co)Mentoring PhD students
• Special acknowledgments in academic theses (~ academic assist)
• High marks as a peer reviewer (Annals Intern Med)
• Sharing data internationally
• Not writing enough grants
• Asking for some space to follow my passion for meta-research and RCR in a clinical department
Harassment in Dutch academia

Exploring manifestations, facilitating factors, effects and solutions

Commissioned by the Dutch Network of Women Professors (LNVH)
Manifestations of harassment

1. Scientific sabotage
2. Sexual harassment
3. Physical threats
4. Verbal threats
5. Denigration
6. Exclusion
7. Not facilitating “special needs”
Looking for help

• Research council director: “not in line management”
• My boss’s boss: “Your boss is the boss”
• Director of the Graduate School: “Good luck”
• Member of the Executive Board (off the record): admitted bad appointment policies for professors
• Occupational doctor: “accept it”
• Ombudsperson: supportive but not effective
• Confidential advisor: supportive, but not effective
• Mediator: tolerated continuation of denigration
“This “pingponging around” of people happened more often, and research participants reported hearing from [...] e.g. confidential advisor, integrity committee, head of department, dean that it was “not their task” to intervene, indicating that

**there is no adequate support system in place.”**
An unsuccessful attempt at whistleblowing

• 2 colleagues (confidential advisor; crying in my office)

• All three had been head of research of the Department

• We drew up a plan

• But did not follow up on it
Effective harassment policies are needed

1. Select leaders more carefully and provisionally. Provide mentorship training, and monitor via the .........

2. Assessment of “workplace climate” in accreditation

3. Teach young scientists how to recognize harassment

4. Design coherent alarm and support systems that can act on patterns
The Academic Assist

Assist (team sports): a pass of such high quality, that another player can score quite simply

Assist (academia): An advice of such high quality that a colleague’s scientific product gains much extra value
# Reconceptualizing Stars: Scientist Helpfulness and Peer Performance

**Alexander Oettl**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of scientist</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Helpfulness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All-star</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone wolf</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maven</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-star</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After ‘helpful’ PIs die in mid-career, their co-authors experience a dramatic decline in high-impact publications and citations. In contrast, there is no significant change in these for co-authors of ‘unhelpful’ PIs after their death (error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals).
Better recognition of team scientists’ contributions is needed

1. Contributions to team-based scholarship and specialized contributions to education must be assessed and appropriately weighted.

2. Evaluations must be founded upon well-articulated criteria for assessing the team scientists’ performance.

3. Mechanisms for collecting evaluative data must be developed and implemented at the institutional level.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Alfons G.H. Kessels (†), a superb medical statistician, for being a role model on the academic assist.

I thank Eric Moll van Charante, Peter Sterk and Lex Bouter for mentorship and support after a very sudden climate change.

I thank Wilma Scholte op Reimer at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences for her trust in me.
Me: classic metrics

### Citations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alles</th>
<th>Sinds 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citaties</td>
<td>13287</td>
<td>5347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h-index</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i10-index</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall citations: John beats me by a factor 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Since 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citations</td>
<td>210785</td>
<td>148049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h-index</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i10-index</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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John Ioannidis
Recognizing manifestations of harassment

1. Scientific sabotage: *research line closed, agreement violated, not granted “Google time” or switch of teams to follow passion*

2. Verbal threats: *firing, formal written warning*

3. Denigration: *my work and expertise (while in mediation)*

4. Exclusion: *degraded, not consulted anymore, marginalized*

5. Not facilitating “special needs”: *software, travel expenses*