



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Standardization in science: effects and issues of guidelines for biomedical reporting

Schniedermann, A.

Citation

Schniedermann, A. (2026, June 11). *Standardization in science: effects and issues of guidelines for biomedical reporting*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4304878>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4304878>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Standardization in Science. Effects and Issues of Guidelines for Biomedical Reporting

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van

de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,

op gezag van rector magnificus prof.dr. S. de Rijcke,

volgens besluit van het college voor promoties

te verdedigen op vrijdag 11 juni 2026

klokke 11.30 uur

door

Alexander Constantin Schniedermann

geboren te Gütersloh, Duitsland

in 1991

Promotores

Prof.dr. S. de Rijcke
Prof.dr. P.F. Wouters

Co-promotor

Dr. W. Kaltenbrunner

Promotiecommissie:

Prof. dr. L.R. Waltman (Wetenschappelijk Directeur CWTS / voorzitter)
Prof. dr. T.N. van Leeuwen
Prof.dr. S.M.E. Wyatt (Universiteit Maastricht)
Dr. B. Penders (Universiteit Maastricht)
Prof.dr. S. Böschen (RWTH Aachen)
Dr. S. Haustein (University of Ottawa)

Acknowledgements

My greatest thanks go to Wolfgang Kaltenbrunner, who supervised and mentored me on a regular basis during the Covid-19 pandemic when it seemed that the science studies ceased to be the most important thing to do. Wolfgang provided me with constructive feedback whenever I needed it and nudged me towards focusing on the important things. I also want to thank Sarah de Rijcke and Paul Wouters, who welcomed me as an external PhD student at CWTS and Leiden University without knowing me very well. Fortunately, the pandemic made pursuing a virtual or long-distance PhD not only feasible but also added a sense of normality to it. Many thanks go to my colleagues, peers, and friends who provided me comments on parts of this dissertation: Isabelle Fiedler, Judith Hartstein, Markus Hoffmann, Nathalie Schwichtenberg, Sven Arend Ulpts, and Lautaro Vilches. I also want to thank all the colleagues whom I bothered with methodological, technical, or theoretical questions: Paul Donner, Alex Fenton, Max Leckert, Roberto Cruz Romero, Marion Schmidt, Stephan Stahlschmidt, and Dimity Stephen.

This dissertation wouldn't be possible without Clemens Bluemel, who was my first project leader at DZHW and always tried to make room for my doctoral research. Likewise, I want to thank Anja Gottburgsen, who made many things easy for a dissertation project that is situated between two research organizations in two different countries. Last but not least, I want to thank my examining committee, the anonymous and non-anonymous reviewers of my publications, and those who listened to my talks and provided me with critical feedback.

The dissertation is probably the largest and most iconic step of an academic career. However, many important experiences and aspects of academic life happen on its sidelines. In this regard, my greatest thanks go to Arno Simons, who showed me how to be a researcher and how to act responsibly and out of curiosity. I want to thank Melpomeni "Melina" Antonakaki in a similar vein. She helped to stay active and engaged in the STS community. Melina always reminds me that academia is not just a steppingstone but a state of life that must be cultivated and cared for. Similarly, I want to thank Marie Christin-Ehrhardt, Lautaro Vilches, and Isabelle Fiedler for joining me as PhD student representatives at DZHW from 2021 to 2023. Together we built and shared the select sense of humor that is required to survive modern academia.

Substantial funding for this project was provided by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (01PU17017); the German Centre for Higher Education Research

and Science Studies (DZHW) as part of the Qualifizierungsfonds; and the German Competence Network Bibliometrics (16WIK2101B). The German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) provided additional travel support.

Table of contents

Tables and figures	8
English summary	9
Samenvatting.....	10
Introduction The greatest scandal in modern science?	13
1.1 <>	21
1.2 Writing knowledge	22
1.3 Codifying medical knowledge	25
1.3.1 The medical research sector	25
1.3.2 Stabilization of concepts, descriptions, and genres	28
1.3.3 Between writing, reading, and understanding	33
1.4 Medical research for the greater good	39
1.4.1 From publication to medical practice	39
1.4.2 (Systematic) reviews, meta-analyses, and EBM	44
1.4.3 Research genres as powerful devices	50
1.5 The wealth of science and knowledge	55
1.5.1 The explosion of medical information	55
1.5.2 Authors and rewards in biomedical sciences	57
1.5.3 The gatekeepers of science	60
1.5.4 Measuring biomedical science.....	65
1.6 The fertile soil for futile science	71
1.6.1 Working for the metrics.....	71
1.6.2 The complex crisis of scholarly communication	77
Chapter 2 Perspectives, purposes, and the project.....	85
2.1 <>	85
2.2 STS and beyond	86
2.3 An experimental trading zone	94
2.4 Research questions and overview.....	103
2.5 Editorial notes	105
2.5.1 Notes on the publication of individual chapters	105
2.5.2 Notes on the usage of generative AI	107
Chapter 3 The birth of a reporting guideline	109

3.1 <>	109
3.2 Certifying biomedical evidence	110
3.3 Methods and theoretical background	114
3.4 Results and discussion: invoking the crisis	119
3.5 Guidelines in the making	122
3.6 Applicability by simplicity	127
3.7 Dissemination by journals.....	129
3.8 Enforcement by gatekeeping.....	133
3.9 Conclusion: templating evidence in biomedicine.....	136
Chapter 4 The philosophy of transparency	139
4.1 <>	139
4.2 Introduction	140
4.3 Data and methods	143
4.4 Standardizing science	145
4.5 Building transparency	150
4.6 How PRISMA blurs the concept of transparency.....	153
4.7 Concluding remarks	160
Chapter 5 The dissemination of PRISMA.....	163
5.1 <>	163
5.2 Introduction	165
5.3 Data and corpus construction	168
5.4 Statistical analysis	169
5.5 Results and discussion	171
5.5.1 The growth and dissemination of systematic reviews.....	171
5.5.2 Systematic reviews by countries	177
5.5.3 Citation impact of PRISMA-based reviews.....	182
5.6 Conclusion.....	186
Chapter 6 Systematic review authors and PRISMA users	189
6.1 <>	189
6.2 Introduction	190
6.3 Data and methods	192
6.4 Results.....	194
6.4.1 Academic age by document type	194
6.4.2 Academic age distribution by medical subfield	198
6.4.3 Academic age distribution by journal	201
6.4.4 Authorship position and familiarization with PRISMA.....	205

6.5 Discussion and conclusions	209
Chapter 7 PRISMA and the practice of writing	213
7.1 <>	213
7.2 Introduction.....	214
7.3 Background.....	217
7.3.1 Systematic reviews and the PRISMA reporting guidelines.....	217
7.3.2 Two perspectives on the standardization of research	219
7.4 Data and methods	221
7.5 Results and discussion.....	222
7.5.1 Contingencies and complexities in writing science	223
7.5.2 Standardized systematic reviews and adjacent genres.....	226
7.5.3 PRISMA and its contexts of use	231
7.6 Conclusions.....	236
Chapter 8 Standardization in science. Discussion and conclusions.....	239
8.1 The lone genius is dead, long live the lone genius!	244
8.2 From meta-analysis to meta-science	251
8.3 Open Science, documentation practices and the future of research evaluation	258
8.4 Closing remarks	266
Glossary and abbreviations	269
References.....	271
Appendix	329
Curriculum vitae	403

Tables and figures

Tables

Table 1 Overview of interview participants (guideline developers and journal editors)	116
Table 2 Overview of PRISMA documents	131
Table 3 Document type assignment quality in Web of Science against PubMed	169
Table 4 Number of publications and growth rates for each document type.....	172
Table 5 Overview of academic age configurations by document type and authorship position	197
Table 6 Authorship characteristics of PRISMA users in selected medical subfields	199
Table 7 Authorship characteristics of PRISMA users in selected journals	202
Table 8 U-test results for different authorship positions.....	207
Table 9 Overview of interviewed PRISMA users	221
Table 10 Authorship characteristics of PRISMA users by field (full table)	359
Table 11 Authorship characteristics of PRISMA users by journals with at least 1000 authorships	360

Figures

Figure 1 Portions of systematic reviews by field	174
Figure 2 Portions of systematic reviews by field and annual rank (2010-2015)	176
Figure 3 Portions of systematic reviews by country	178
Figure 4 Portions of systematic reviews by country and annual rank (2010-2015).....	180
Figure 5 Citation impact of different document types (absolute, mean-normalized, percentile rank)	182
Figure 6 Annual citation percentile ranks of different document types by citation windows	183
Figure 7 Distributions of academic age by document type.....	195
Figure 8 PRISMA-citation rate for individual academic age groups in selected medical subfields	201
Figure 9 PRISMA-citation rate for individual academic age groups in selected journals	204
Figure 10 PRISMA usage rates by age group and authorship position	206
Figure 11 Prediction of PRISMA usage rate by age group, current authorship and previous authorship	208