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Abstract

Introduction: Leiden Manifesto (LM) is ten principles to guide quantitative research evaluation\textsuperscript{1}. Four universities have launched policies on responsible metrics inspired by LM\textsuperscript{2}. As supplement or alternative to these top-down implementations, we explore a bottom-up approach.

Objective: A sound bibliometric analysis that meets the requests from clients can be a demanding task. The foci of bibliometricians and clients do not always overlap\textsuperscript{3, 4}. We test if LM can be used as a “consumer label” on a bibliometric analysis, providing information about the contents and facilitating responsible use.

Methodology: We select two typical cases within health sciences from Copenhagen University Library Bibliometric Service. The first is a bibliometric analysis of Department of Forensic Medicine. The second is a calculation of bibliometric indicators for a European Research Council proposal. “Consumer labels” are developed for both cases, and discussed with the department head and the grant applicant, respectively.

Selected results: We see the following potentials in developing “consumer labels”:
- In evaluation of own practice bibliometricians could do more to ensure that those evaluated verify and legitimize the analysis (Principle 5).
- In interpretation of the analysis, remind clients that not all research activities and publications are covered and how this can affect the results (Principle 3).
- Question the division of responsibilities. Emphasize it is the responsibility of the client to supply the research mission and the bibliometrician to select appropriate indicators (Principle 2).\textsuperscript{3}

The two clients are knowledgeable about bibliometric indicators but to systematically discuss a responsible use of the indicators was unfamiliar to the clients.

Conclusion: Even though there are potentials in the “consumer labels”, we find that the implementation of LM becomes subjective. Specifically, the division of responsibilities is not described for any of the ten principles, the standard for fulfilling a principle is not clear, and the dualism of LM as a documentary and comparative tool is not discussed.
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