

My 2002 citation boycott

This is a warning to scientists who are doing a proper job of critically discussing competitive scientific results.

Citations are crucial to any scientific publication. Not referencing somebody's work in a proper context is plagiarism at the borderline of a criminal act if done on purpose. In 2002, I became the victim of a citation blockade, which is still going on. My official peer reviewed papers in this field, about 100 according to Research Gate, mostly date before 2002. They got about 6000 citations. The group of people, dominating the field of bio-neutron scattering and protein dynamics, told me into my face, they would exclude my work from further citations. The initiative was primarily organized by Hans Frauenfelder, J. Zaccai and J. Smith, well respected scientists, and this is fully documented in the literature. In J. Smith's review on protein dynamics of 2015, my extensive work on elastic neutron scattering (JCP, 2013) is not cited. In a more recent review of the Schreiber group (QRB 2019), my work is either ignored or negatively cited. At a conference in Rome 2009, I observed that Hans Frauenfelder was running around black-mailing me. At the same conference, Gene Stanley, at the time Editor of PNAS, warned me, that Hans Frauenfelder was heavily determined to remove me from the field. This central goal would help to extend his life. He was right. In 2018 at the ECNS in St. Petersburg I had announced a fundamental new interpretation of bio-neutron scattering spectra. My contribution was downgraded as a poster, although there was enough spare time for talk at the bio-session and some people got several talks. Although J. Zaccai published probably 100 papers on the "Dynamical Transition", which I had introduced in 1989, I have not seen a single paper as a referee. Also, when he got the Hälger prize of neutron scattering in 2013, I was not asked for my opinion as the leading scientist on this topic. My contribution was overlooked. He got the prize, although we had disproven some essential parts of his work with several publications. In 2019, the 96 year old Hans Frauenfelder was asked by J. Chem Physics to review one of my submissions. He rejected it, because, as the only argument, he could not see anything new. The answer had at least 10 counter arguments. But he had never done any research in neutron scattering and was thus totally incompetent. The co-referee, a MD computer scientist (the name is known), who was originally very positive, changed his view after reading the HF report. He complained about our critical review of related work. The Editor refused to involve a third referee with at least some expertise in neutron scattering. The manuscript was then rejected.

What did I do wrong? What was my problem? I figure: I had made well justified critical comments to some of their publications in my papers and in referee reports. There was a difference in opinion, which could not be discussed.

If your work is not cited, it makes no sense to continue research in this field. You no longer exist, in spite of 100 publications, which are overlooked.

I thus started to diminish my activities in bio-neutron scattering after 2003. I even reduced my full time job at the TUM. Me and the members of my group still made a number of significant, inappropriately cited, publications, up to date.

What kept me going was the striking number of faulty publications in this field, far above average.