Report of the LUMC Committee on Scientific Integrity, on its investigation of a possible breach of scientific integrity by

Leiden, 1 September 2015
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1. Introduction

1.1 Preambule
Because the investigation concerns a foreign citizen who does not speak Dutch, this report is written in English.

1.2 Charge of the Committee
The Board of Directors of the Leiden University Medical Center (LUMC), hereafter ‘the Board’, has charged the Committee on Scientific Integrity (Commissie Wetenschappelijke Integriteit, CWI), hereafter ‘the Committee’, to reopen the investigation into possible breaches of scientific integrity (scientific misconduct) within the NER-group (Nucleotide Excision Repair) of the Department of [ ], (since 2014 part of the Department of [ ] by [ ] This investigation follows that of a previous ad hoc committee, and an appeal at the National Board for Research Integrity (Landelijk Orgaan Wetenschappelijke Integriteit, LOWI), that had advised to reopen the case, and include information that was not available at the beginning of the first investigation. The charge from the Board of Directors is appended to this report (Appendix I).

The Committee follows its own investigative agenda guided by the Regulations Scientific Integrity (Regeling Wetenschappelijke Integriteit LUMC), which is in accordance with guidance from the Dutch universities (VSNU: Nederlandse Gedragscode Wetenschapsbeoefening 2004, 2012), Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW: Notitie Wetenschappelijke Integriteit, 2001) and of the EU European Science Foundation (ESF: The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity, 2011). These regulations were established in 2013 and made public on the intranet (Albinusnet) of the LUMC. In its actual activities the Committee is guided by the Standard Operating Procedure Scientific Integrity (‘SOP Wetenschappelijke Integriteit’, version 30 March 2015), made public on the Albinusnet [ ]. According to this protocol, scientific misconduct is defined as one or more of the following:

a. falsification of data (‘het vervalsen van gegevens’)
b. fabrication of data (‘het fabriceren van valse gegevens’)
c. withholding of data (‘het heimelijk achterhouden van gegevens’)
d. the entering of fictive data (‘het invoeren van fictieve gegevens’)
e. on purpose use of inappropriate statistical methods to achieve different conclusions than justified by the data (‘het opzettelijk verkeerd gebruik van statistische methoden om andere conclusies te bereiken dan de gegevens rechtvaardigen’)
f. on purpose wrongful interpretation of results and conclusions (‘het opzettelijk verkeerd interpreteren van resultaten en conclusies’)
g. plagiarism of results or publications of others or acting as an author without justification or purposefully leaving out other authors (‘plagiaat van resultaten of publicaties van anderen of het zich ongerechtvaardigd voordoen als auteur of medeauteur of het opzettelijk weglaten van andere auteurs’)
h. acting unacceptably inaccurate in performing research (‘het onzorgvuldig te werk gaan bij het verrichten van onderzoek’)
i. theft of intellectual property (‘diefstal van intellectueel eigendom’)

3
The Committee set out with six aims:

1) to determine whether a breach of scientific integrity had occurred, and if so, how serious this was;
2) whether such a breach of scientific integrity was committed by the defendant;
3) to cleanse, if necessary, the scientific literature;
4) to investigate external factors that could have contributed to a breach of scientific integrity;
5) to make recommendations for education and prevention;
6) to assess whether individuals had been harmed by the breaches of scientific integrity.

The report of the Committee, once it is accepted by the Board of Directors, will be made public. The Committee has included two ad hoc members for this investigation, because of their expertise in this specific research field. For this investigation, the Dean is pro forma complainant, and the defendant.

The Committee was constituted as follows:

- Prof. dr F.R. Rosendaal, Clinical Epidemiology, LUMC (chairman)
- Prof. dr P. ten Dijke, Molecular Celbiology, LUMC
- Prof. dr R.A.C. Roos, Neurology, LUMC
- Prof. dr D.P. Engberts, Ethics and Law, LUMC
- Prof. dr P.H. Reitsma, Experimental and Molecular Medicine, LUMC (member ad hoc)
- Prof. dr J. Brouwer, Chemistry, School of Mathematics and Natural Sciences (WN) (member ad hoc)
- Mrs A.E. Hoeksema, director Governmental and Legal Issues, LUMC (advisor)

Prof. Reitsma and Prof. Brouwer were the members added to the Committee. Administrative support was provided by Mrs Y.T.R. Mees ten Oever, Research Directorate, LUMC.

1.3 Background

On 20 June 2011, [redacted], at that time head of the Department of [redacted], reported a suspected breach of scientific integrity by a former employee, [redacted], to the Dean. This complaint was filed two months after a PhD fellow and technician had presented him with information on possible data manipulation. The Dean subsequently formed an ad hoc committee led by Prof. dr F. Koning (hereafter called ‘ad hoc committee’) to investigate the complaint, which was laid down in what became labelled as ‘Dossier Juli 2011’. This file was a collection of data, presentations, and figures compiled by the PhD fellow and the technician. This ad hoc committee focussed on the two published articles (3,4) respectively the PhD fellow and the technician. This ad hoc committee focussed on the two published articles (3,4) (numbers refer to Appendix II with the full references) and hitherto unpublished material that was collected for a meeting presentation, which formed the content of the complaint. After hearing a limited number of individuals, including [redacted], the ad hoc committee reported on 8 March 2013 that they had found evidence of irregularities in two publications (3,4). The defendant had admitted having manipulated the data in one figure in one publication (4), which admission later was retracted. The ad hoc committee concluded that due to manipulations the results might be unreliable. They could not find definite evidence to pinpoint who had manipulated the data.

The Board informed the defendant by letter of 15 March 2013, which led to some correspondence, after which the Board informed [redacted] on 10 January 2014 about the ad hoc committee’s final conclusion that irregularities were present in two papers for part of which [redacted].
accepted the responsibility. However, the final conclusion, as reported by the Board to the defendant, was that there was no definite proof of a breach of scientific integrity by the defendant, given the complexity of the research and the lack of evidence pinpointing who was responsible for the other irregularities. The ad hoc committee also considered it relevant that senior co-authors of the publications expressed their continued belief in their scientific validity.

An appeal at LOWI (Landelijk Orgaan Wetenschappelijke Integriteit) was filed on 17 February 2014 by the former PhD student, amongst others arguing that additional materials that had been offered to the ad hoc committee during its investigation should have been investigated too, as well as information pertaining to unpublished research results, rather than only two publications. After studying the documents and a hearing for all involved in which data were shown, amongst others from the personal computer at the LUMC of the defendant, the LOWI wrote on 11 December 2014 to the Board that the irregularities appeared substantial and severe, and should be investigated in a more extensive investigation than by the ad hoc committee, in particular also including the publications of 2006 and 2007 of (1,2), as well as materials from the personal computer of the defendant. If possible, an investigation should determine whether the defendant had stored these data on this personal computer. Of note, the LOWI expressed the opinion that malversations in unpublished material did not constitute a breach of scientific integrity. The summary of the LOWI advice (LOWI advies 2014, nr 12) is made public on its website (http://www.lowi.nl/nl/bestanden/LOWIadvies2014nr12.pdf), and appended to this report (Appendix III).

1.4 Activities of the Committee
The Committee has followed the Standard Operating Procedure Scientific Integrity (‘SOP Wetenschappelijke Integriteit’, version 30 March 2015). According to this protocol, admissibility of a complaint has to be investigated first, and reported to the Board. Subsequently, the Committee has made extensive investigations to come to a conclusion and recommendations. To this effect, the Committee has received information from the Department of including lab journals and films of experiments, as well as the hard disk from the personal computer of the defendant, and studied these materials in combination with the documentation of the ad hoc committee, the LOWI and five publications (1-5). The general aim was to obtain an answer to the questions posed under 1.2 by all possible means. The Committee, in accordance with the advice of LOWI, did not involve itself with unpublished material, but did include all publications that could help to come to a conclusion, including publications for which experimental work was done in Leiden, but also before and after. The general approach was to reconstruct a publication from primary data to the publication in the public domain. The Committee has spoken to individuals who were closely involved, such as former PhD students, technicians, supervisors and co-authors, as well as co-workers of the former Department of who were not directly involved. All hearings were in person, except with individuals (other than the defendant) who resided abroad. The purpose of these hearings was firstly to determine how the experiments were done and how and by whom the publications were prepared, and secondly to obtain a view on the atmosphere at the department, the intercollegial relations and the standards with regard to integrity.

The Committee has submitted its prefinal report to the Board of Directors on 10 July 2015. This has subsequently been sent to the defendant for comments. These have been received on 10 August 2015 and have not led to changes to the report. The prefinal report has also been made available to the
former head of the Department of [redacted] and the appellant at the LOWI, whose comments have led to a few small changes, not related to the conclusions and recommendations.

1.3.1 Admissibility
The Committee has concluded that the complaint was admissible based on the results of the investigation by LOWI as reported in the LOWI’s advice of 11 December 2014, and has informed the Board of this on 17 December 2014. The most relevant aspect for admissibility was that additional information on publications and other data were submitted to the LOWI that had not been investigated before at the LUMC.

1.3.2 Hearings
Between 9 January and 5 June 2015 the Committee held hearings with two former PhD students, three technicians, four group leaders, the former department head (also group leader of the so-called NER-group), a co-author, the current department head, and the defendant. The Committee chairman held telephone conversations with one former PhD student and two senior authors all residing abroad, in some cases followed by communications by e-mail. Two former PhD students, all working in collaborating departments at the time and now residing abroad were contacted by e-mail. A list of those who were heard is appended (Appendix IV) to the report.

2. Findings
2.1 Origin of the data
The data on the USB stick presented at LOWI and the hard disk have been investigated by Hoffmann Bedrijfsrecherche (an external company specialised in forensic research), and were found to be identical (Appendix V). According to the hearings of department employees this hard disk contained data that were entered by the defendant, which was not denied by [redacted]. It appeared not technically possible to retrieve actual login data from the LUMC informatics system, given the time that had passed. For all publications except one it was possible to relate original data from laboratory journals, and the powerpoint figures that were still available and that had been shared with co-authors and the journals, to the data presented in the figures. These powerpoint figures containing several of the irregularities below, originated from the hard disk that contained files saved on it by [redacted] in the LUMC, as well as presentations provided this and the previous committee during their investigations. For one publication (1) no laboratory journals were available, and all findings relate to the publication itself. The findings are given in detail under 2.2, where the numbers refer to the item numbering in Appendix VI.

2.2 Findings with regard to the publications
1. [redacted] et al., 2006.
0. Duplication of Fig. 1C CSA, right two lanes (normal) and Fig. 1B CSB, soluble fraction, right two lanes.
1. Duplication of Fig. 1D RNAPIIo, pellet blot and Fig. S2C RNAPIIo blot.
2. Duplications of part of Fig. 1D and Fig. S2D.
3. Duplications of part of Fig. 1B and Fig. 2SA.
4. Duplications of part of Fig. 1D and Fig. S2A.
5. Duplications of part of Fig. 2A and Fig. 4A.
6. Reuse of part of Fig. 3D top panel in Fig. 3E top panel.
7. Possible duplication of images in Fig. 3A top panel and Fig. 5A top panel.
8. Duplications of part of Fig. 3D and Fig. 5C.
9. Fig. 4D. CSB Panel appears put together in an unusual way.
10. Fig. 5C. P300 panel, bands in untreated normal and untreated CS-A cells appear to be identical (mirror image).
11. Fig. S2C and S2D, CSB panels are the same, albeit with different exposure.
12. Fig. S2C and S2D, RPA panels are the same, albeit with different exposure.
13. Fig. S2C and S2D, XPF panels are the same, albeit with different exposure.
14. Fig. S2A and S2B, CSB panels appear the same.
15. Fig. S2C and S2D, RPA panels are the same, albeit with different exposure.
16. Fig. S2A, lanes 1 and 4 are duplicated.
17. Fig. S2A and Fig. S2B top panels are duplicated.
18. Fig. S2D, duplication of two adjacent bands.
19. Duplication of Fig. 5C (..... et al, 2006) in Fig. 4A (..... et al., 2007).

20. Fig. 4B bands in XPG blot are the same as XPG blot aspecific band of ChIP exp 24-04-2006.
21. Fig. 4B, pold signals correspond to lig3 blotting results.
22. Fig. 4B. XRCC1 signals correspond to XPA results in ChIP exp 24-04-2006.
23. Fig. 4B PCNA signals may correspond to PCNA blotting results Chip 20-02-06.
24. Fig. 4B bands in XPA blot are the same as XRCC1 signals of ChIP exp 24-04-2006.
25. Possible duplication of Fig. 5C (..... et al) in Fig. 4A (..... et al.); mirror image.

26. Fig. 5 CsB controls (In Fig. 5A and Fig. 5C identical) are clearly from experiment ChIP 10-08-2009. All other signals in Fig. 5A, 5B and 5C are clearly not derived from this experiment.
27. RNAPolII signal in Fig. 5A is derived from ChIP 3 (present in our files). However it has been flipped left/right and the empty marker lane is used as negative control for wt cells.
28. The H2A signal from Fig. 5A and 5C is the RPA signal from blot 3 (present in our files).

29. Fig. 1D: RPA signal is clearly derived from ChIP 22-102007 and is in reality the XRCC1 signal (this gel is in our files).
30. Fig. 1G: RPA signal is also derived from ChIP 22-10-2009 and is in reality the XRCC1 signal from a PCNA ChIP and certainly not a pol kappa ChIP as stated. (The original film is in our files).
31. Fig. 1G: Pol delta signal is clearly derived from gel 29-10-07 but flipped vertically and is not +/- UV but +UV/+UV+Hu-AraC. (The original film is in our files).
32. Fig. 1H: Pol kappa signal is clearly derived from ChIP 30-07-07 which is an PCNA Chip and not as stated a XRCC1 ChIP 9. (The original film is in our files).
5. et al., 2005

33. Fig. 7: Duplication of a band indicating RNAPIIa in two different experiments (5 versus 2.5 J/m² and 24 h versus 0 time point).

34. Fig. 7: Duplication of a band indicating RNAPIIa in two different experiments (one 5 and another 2.5 J/m² treatment).

Note: most of the irregularities in the figures concerned parts of figures that had been moved to other figures, in the same or other publications, where in some cases they were changed in appearance by mirroring the blot or changing the background brightness, and in several instances these were results from completely different experiments. Moreover, several times the same results (blots) were shown in a figure as representing different proteins. In cases where the experts were not totally convinced the figures were indeed identical, this is presented as ‘possible’.

For several of the irregularities, the Committee sought external objective confirmation of its findings. This was done by foreign external experts who regularly use a manual based photoshop action as recommended by the Office of Research Integrity (ORI, USA), to which one of the publications (1) was submitted (see https://ori.hhs.gov/forensic-tools). Without any prior information on the findings of the Committee, they detected the same irregularities the Committee had found. When co-authors were confronted with the findings, both a senior co-author from another institution and the former head of the department of [redacted] who was at the time also group leader of the NER-group, concluded that the 2006 publication (1) contained serious and unacceptable manipulations. The former department chairman also commented on the unpublished figures that were constructed for a meeting presentation and subject of the investigations of the previous committee as being clearly fraudulent.

2.3 Origin of the irregularities

During the hearing, [redacted] admitted that [redacted] had manipulated the data. In a few instances [redacted] contested whether the irregularities were indeed irregularities, while in the vast majority [redacted] either said that these were mistakes or that these had been done on purpose to make a figure look better. [redacted] maintained that in all instances the figures corresponded to the scientific truth, i.e., the results of other experiments. Concerning the Supplementary Figure 2 in the 2006 publication (1), initial experiments had indicated to her that EtBr/DNA had no effect on protein-protein interaction identified by ChIP (these results are not available). [redacted] could not remember how this Figure was made, which appears to have been constructed with parts of various previous experiments. [redacted] argued that the section head was aware of these adjustments and had condoned them, and that [redacted] had acted according to the prevailing standards in the department. The reason for the manipulation of the figures was on the one hand pressure to finish a revised version of a publication – this refers to the 2006 publication (1) –, but also because, [redacted] argued, it was common practice to use parts of different experiments to construct a figure, which was acceptable
as long as the figure depicted the findings as found in other experiments. In rebuttal to the prefinal report reiterated this position.

2.4 Investigations of the department

From the hearings of the various current group leaders it became clear that the former Department of had five sections that operated almost completely independent. Discussions of primary data took place in these separate groups, of which the so-called NER-group was one. There were presentations of work in progress to the whole department, but this did not include the presentation or discussion of primary data, but rather was done with the use of complex figures as also found in the publications. The group leaders formed the Scientific Committee of the department that met on an irregular basis, without a clear mandate, and without taking minutes. The atmosphere in the department was described by most as pleasant and unintimidating. The NER-group was led by the chairman of the whole Department of None of the other group leaders was aware of any controversies or suspicions surrounding the publications of until this was reported by a PhD fellow and a technician in 2011. The head of the department reported the accusation in the departmental Scientific Committee, where it was shortly discussed, during one session. The Committee has focussed on the way of working in the NER-group. Several of those heard, including the former head of the group, described that after came to Leiden in 2002, who had previously been a post-doc in Brighton (UK), rapidly developed into an independent researcher. led a small subgroup in the NER-group, which operated largely autonomously, without much supervision from the NER group leader. Over time this led to strained relations between the group leader and which eventually led to the composition of a signed agreement about future collaborations between and the head of the department when left the LUMC in 2010.

The head of the department stated that he, due to this autonomous activity of the defendant, did not see original experimental results, and therefore did not oversee the construction of figures from these for publications and presentations. He states that he never even saw the Supplemental Figure of the 2006 publication (1), which was where most irregularities have been found by the Committee. Although he strongly condemned using results from completely different experiments in one figure, he felt it was acceptable to do an experiment in an identical fashion three times, and then construct a new figure out of the three experiments, as long as this represented the overall results.

3. Conclusions

The Committee concludes that serious breaches of scientific integrity have been committed by while employed at the Leiden University Medical Center. Following the listing of scientific misconduct as given in 1.2, this falls under a. falsification of data and h. acting unacceptably inaccurate in performing research. With reference to the LUMC code of conduct for scientific integrity (Regeling Wetenschappelijke Integriteit LUMC) it is considered scientific misconduct to wilfully manipulate research results to make them look better. Given the large number of instances in which figures were manipulated, which took place in several publications over a period of several years, and which have grievously misled readers, the Committee concludes that this constitutes a serious breach of scientific integrity. The Committee concludes that several publications need to be retracted. The section in which the defendant worked lacked adequate supervision and administration,
did not profess a sufficiently critical approach to experimental results and allowed that figures were constructed from several experiments. This explains some of the misconduct, but does not exonerate the defendant, since malversations went much further than what was condoned, and moreover, according to the LUMC Code of Conduct, a researcher is responsible for his or her own actions. It became clear to the Committee that since the events that it investigated took place, steps have been taken to amend the deficiencies that were present in some parts of the department by the current head of the Department of .... Finally, several PhD students who worked in the department did not complete their PhD, which at least in one case was directly related to the scientific misconduct by ....

The Committee has found that in several published articles there were multiple instances of data manipulation, in which parts of figures were wilfully changed. In some cases it was clear that the true results were or may have been of a similar nature, in some they were not, or were not available. At least in one instance a Supplementary Figure has been constructed by cutting and pasting of other results and it does not represent results of experiments that were performed. In none of the publications were the figures accompanied by a legend suggesting anything else than that these were fair and true representations of single experiments, and therefore the Committee sees all these manipulations as breaches of scientific integrity, although not all equally serious. The defendant, ..., has admitted for most of the irregularities that were presented to ..., that ... had manipulated the figures either on purpose or by mistake. While it is conceivable that during the composition of a figure consisting of many blots mistakes occur, this process of composition between lanes using different parts of the gel without indication, as well as combining the results from different independent biological experiments in the same Figure, is a breach of scientific integrity in itself. The product of research activities, i.e., a publication in a scientific journal, should be transparent and give the reader a clear description of the methods that were used to obtain the results, enabling the reader to interpret the results and repeat the experiment, which replication and confirmation is a cornerstone of science. When figures are composed of the results of many experiments, and are transposed to show what may have been seen, should have been seen or what was seen in a less clear way, the reader is misled. It should be noted that the Committee has only been able to investigate a minority of the data that were presented in the publications, since in many instances primary data were lacking or not properly archived. The Committee did also not investigate unpublished data that were used in scientific presentations. Multiple instances of data manipulation have been found in all five publications that the Committee has investigated. These are clearly most numerous in two publications (1,2), which originated from the LUMC, that will need to be retracted. In two other publications the manipulations were less numerous (3,4), but still of a nature that the Committee believes retraction is in order. However, since these publications did not originate from the LUMC, which only provided part of the experiments, the Committee advises further action to be taken by the institutes in the United Kingdom, where the main responsibility for these publication lies. Finally, although not the result of acceptable practice, the irregularities in the fifth paper (5), for which the main responsibility also resided at another institution, led the Committee to suggest a correction to be sent to the journal in which the manuscript was published.

From the investigations of the Committee, it has become clear that the then Department of .... had several sections, which operated almost completely independently. The leaders of the other sections were therefore not aware, and could not have been aware, of the malverstations until these were reported. The section in which .... worked (the NER-group) was led by ... who was also chairman of the department. This was a group that worked independently from the other
sections, and which was led by [redacted] and [redacted], who initially worked closely together. The claim of [redacted] that the manner in which figures were constructed was condoned by the head of the section, was not supported by information from other section leaders, and referred to a way of working that was clearly not customary in the other sections of the Department. It is not possible that any of these irregularities or the reports thereof were fabrications by others to damage [redacted] since they were committed over a long period, during which not a single employee was continuously part of the group that worked with [redacted]. It has become clear, though, that within the section led by [redacted] supervision was inadequate and proper administration and archiving of experimental results was often lacking. Moreover, the former section head [redacted] professed views in which data were expected to conform to untested biologic realities, which may have led to an atmosphere in which the construction of figures from several experiments could be considered as implicitly condoned. Finally, in the subgroup in which [redacted] came to work it was allowed to construct figures from independent experiments with identical setup. This explains why [redacted] admitted to the manipulations, but qualified them as mistakes. While to some extent this practice exonerates [redacted], it does not justify the large number of manipulations in several publications, over a period of several years.

The section in which [redacted] worked had no uniform way of guaranteeing the integrity of research, and there was no protocol in which standards and procedures were described. Generally accepted archiving processes, such as keeping a laboratory journal, were not always followed, although some individuals did so meticulously. The head of the section could have been aware of this, and professed a belief in adequate archiving to the Committee, but has not enforced it. There was no policy with regard to experimental validation of results, no critical discussion of the selection of primary data for inclusion in manuscripts. Generally, it seems the concept of falsification did not exist: hypotheses became biological truths, and experiments were considered successful when they confirmed the hypotheses. The Committee concludes that the lack of adequate procedures, and the lack of enforcing of generally accepted procedures, as well as a general uncritical attitude have contributed to the breaches of scientific integrity. The Committee has noted that since these events came to light the head of the Department of [redacted] has retired, and the department has become part of the Department of [redacted] The head of this department has taken measures to assure scientific integrity throughout the department.

Several PhD students who worked in the Department’s section led by [redacted] and [redacted] did not complete their PhD, which in one case was directly related to the scientific misconduct reported here, as well as in unpublished experiments that have not been investigated by this Committee, and in one case was likely to be related to the way in which the leadership of the section operated.
4. Recommendations to the LUMC Board of Directors

1. that [REDACTED] is informed by the Board of Directors that [REDACTED] has committed serious breaches of scientific integrity and will be handed a copy of this report.

2. that the following individuals and organisations receive a copy of this report:
   - the complainant for the LOWI appeal
   - the Board of Leiden University (‘College van Bestuur’).
   - the former head of the Department of [REDACTED]
   - the head of the Department of [REDACTED]
   - all current and former employees of the Department of [REDACTED] who were heard by the Committee
   - the chairman of [REDACTED]
   - the chairman of the LUMC Research Committee (‘Vaste Commissie Wetenschap’)
   - the chairman of the Committee on Good Research Practices
   - the chairman of the LUMC Medical Ethics Committee
   - the National Board for Research Integrity (Landelijk Orgaan Wetenschappelijke Integriteit, LOWI)
   - the current employer of [REDACTED]
   - all authors of the five publications that were investigated by the Committee
   - the Boards of the [REDACTED]
   - all organisations or institutions that provided funding for the experiments leading to the publications that were investigated by the Committee
   - the Editors in Chief of [REDACTED]
   - the Public Prosecution Office (‘Openbaar Ministerie’)

3. that two publications will be retracted:

4. that the [REDACTED] are urged to further investigate and to take appropriate action concerning the publications that originated from these institutions (3-5).

5. that the Dean, through the Committee on Research (‘Vaste Commissie Wetenschap’) or Committee for Good Research Practice, promotes education on archiving of laboratory results, with an assessment of the potential use of electronic laboratory journals, emphasises the importance of
departmental scientific committees, and lists the dos and don’ts concerning the composition of figures from laboratory experiments.

6. that the Dean investigates whether individuals have suffered unjustified detrimental effects to their career because of this case and if possible and so desired offers assistance in repairing such effects.

7. that this report will be made public in full via intranet and internet.
Geachte heer Rosendaal,

In juni van het jaar 2011 heeft de Raad van Bestuur een klacht ontvangen van [masking], inzake een vermoeden van de schending van wetenschappelijke integriteit door [masking], een voormalig medewerker van het LUMC, thans werkzaam aan [masking].

Om deze klacht te onderzoeken hebben wij destijds een ad hoc Onderzoekscommissie ingesteld o.l.v. Prof. Koning. Deze commissie is, na diepgaand en langdurig onderzoek van een daartoe door [masking] en zijn medewerkers (w.o. [masking]) samengesteld dossier en hoor en wederhooft van betrokkenen tot de conclusie gekomen dat niet met volledige zekerheid te bepalen was de onregelmatigheden in het onderzoek, die de commissie heeft kunnen vaststellen, aan [masking] toe te schrijven waren.


[Masking] kreeg van het LOWI de gelegenheid nieuwe data op tafel te leggen, afkomstig van de harde schijf van de PC die waarschijnlijk door [masking] is gebruikt tijdens haar dienstverband met het LUMC. Volgens [masking] is het op grond van deze nieuwe data, die niet betrokken waren in het onderzoek van de Commissie Koning, duidelijk dat er gemanipuleerd is in het onderzoek van [masking].

Het LOWI heeft het LUMC gevraagd te reageren op deze nieuwe data.
De Raad van Bestuur heeft met behulp van het directoraat ICT vastgesteld dat de nieuwe data zeer waarschijnlijk afkomstig zijn van de harde schijf van [versleuteld]. Daarna is contact gezocht met de voorzitter van het LOWI en is afgesproken dat het onderzoek heropend zal worden, om deze nieuwe data te laten beoordelen. Het LOWI zal in afwachting van de uitzonden van dit onderzoek geen advies uitbrengen aan de Raad van Bestuur.

Omdat het LUMC sinds 2013 een vaste Commissie Wetenschappelijke integriteit kent, willen wij u vragen om het onderzoek naar [versleuteld] te heropenen en na afloop van het onderzoek ons te adviseren.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Prof.dr. P.C.W. Hogendoorn,
Decaan, Lid Raad van Bestuur