



### English Summary

This is a summary of the advice to the Board of Directors of the Committee on Scientific Integrity of the Leiden University and the Leiden University Medical Center, dated 11 November 2019 of a complaint about scientific misconduct of [REDACTED], Department of Psychology, University Leiden.

### The allegations

The complaint, submitted to the Committee on 27 February 2019, had five parts:

1. Research performed without permission of the ethics committee of the department of Psychology
2. Research performed without permission of the Medical Ethics Committee
3. Plagiarism
4. Data manipulation
5. Submission of grant proposals with incorrect information

### Investigations of the Committee

The committee has evaluated the complaint within the framework of the Netherlands Code for Research, as well as the Regulations for complaints of the institution. The Committee has questioned the complainants and the defendant, as well as several other employees who could provide further information, has investigated relevant e-mails, book chapters, datasets, publications and grant proposals. Based on these investigations, the Committee has come to the conclusion that there have been several breaches of scientific integrity, for which the defendant is responsible.

### Considerations

1. Research with permission of the departmental ethics committee  
The complainant has performed studies with psychological tests in volunteers, sometimes after admission of food supplements, and also in individuals using psychedelic substances for recreational purposes. There have been several instances where such studies were done without prior approval of the ethics committee. The Committee judges this as improper behavior which is against institutional regulations, but does not see these actions as a breach of scientific integrity, since the requirement of departmental ethics approval is not clearly laid down and codified, and does not result from national laws. In this respect the Committee follows the Code, where it says that non-adherence to norms of appropriate scientific behaviour do not necessarily imply breaches of scientific integrity.
2. Research without permission of the Medical Ethics Committee



According to Dutch law, specific forms of biomedical research is only allowed with prior approval of an accredited Medical Ethics Committee. This concerns, amongst others, research involving administering medicinal drugs, or studies with invasive interventions, such as blood draws. The complainant has admitted that she has performed a study with blood draws without prior consent of a Medical Ethics Committee. The Committee judges this as a breach of scientific integrity, since the requirement follows national law and international principles, and the requirement is generally seen as a cornerstone of bona fide research. The Committee has also come to the conclusion that some of the studies on individuals using psychedelic drugs, who were incapacitated by this, should have been evaluated by a Medical ethics Committee.

3. Plagiarism

Defendant has published a book as editor, in which she authors 18 chapters. Seven of these show a high similarity of previously published work, on all of which the complainant was co-author. For some chapters the similarity is nearly complete. The Committee notes that the complainant was co-author of the original work, and hence the accusation of plagiarism is unfounded. However, other authors of the original manuscripts were not listed as co-authors in the book, and in one chapter new authors were added, who could not have contributed to it. Hence, the Committee comes to the conclusion that the complainant has inappropriately deleted and inserted authors, which is a breach of scientific integrity.

4. Data manipulation

In two studies, the complainant has selectively deleted participant data in the analysis. In both cases, this concerned more than half of the participants. In the publication, only results of the participants that remained were given, without any mention of the deleted data. The Committee sees this as a breach of scientific integrity.

5. Submission of grant proposals with incorrect information

In three grant proposals, to the Dutch Research Council (NOW), to the Joint Programme Initiatives (JPI) and to the European Research Council (ERC), complainant has presented non-existent 'preliminary research'. These concern detailed graphs of complicated studies including genotyping and psychological tests. Complainant has admitted for one of these that she intended to write 'expected results'. The Committee does not see this as plausible given the detailed information provided in the grant application, and comes to the conclusion that this presentation of non-existing data is a breach of scientific integrity.

Decision

The report, in Dutch, has been sent to the Board of Directors of Leiden University on 11 November 2019. On 26 November 2019 the Board has taken a provisional decision to accept the advice of the Committee, providing the opportunity for a second opinion with the Netherlands Board on Research Integrity (LOWI), of the Netherlands Royal Academy of Arts and Sciences.