

**SUMMARY GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF DUKE-NUS FACULTY DOSSIERS
FOR REVIEW BY UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE (UPTC)**

(A) Types of Faculty Appointment Reviewed by UPTC

S/N	Faculty Appointment Type	Proposed Faculty Academic Rank
1	Appointment + Award of Tenure	Associate Professor / Professor
2	Promotion + Award of Tenure	Associate Professor / Professor
3	Promotion of Tenured Faculty	Professor E.g. Promotion from tenured Associate Professor to tenured Professor
4	Award of Tenure	Associate Professor / Professor

(B) Dossier Requirements

The dossier must clearly identify how the candidate has distinguished himself / herself in research, education and service. It is the candidate's responsibility to demonstrate the level of quality of his / her work and to provide evidence of achievements.

If a dossier has been through review by the Duke-NUS Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Committee and Dean but has yet to be submitted to the UPTC, the candidate will be allowed to update his / her dossier only once by detailing such new material in an Addendum which would be submitted to the UPTC as a separate write-up to the dossier.

1. APT Cover Letter

This letter is from the Signature Research Programme (SRP) Director / Academic Clinical Programme (ACP) Chair / Head of Office (HOO) of Education to the Duke-NUS APT Committee.

The APT cover letter should also include:

- (i) The current Duke-NUS faculty appointment academic rank that the candidate is holding and the date that he / she was appointed at or promoted to this current academic rank.
- (ii) New / additional / expanded / major contributions and achievements made by the candidate from his / her last appointment / promotion till to-date that will warrant the proposed promotion or award of tenure.
- (iii) A summary of the discussion and recommendations by the SRP / ACP Nomination and Appointment Committee (NAC) on the candidate's proposed appointment / promotion, including the votes cast by the NAC members.
- (iv) A list of referees recommended, indicating nominator, the candidate's relationship to the nominees (if any), referees selected, those who accepted, those who did not respond, and those who declined to evaluate with reasons, if provided.

2. Academic Council (AC) Cover Letter

The AC cover letter is required for:

- (i) Associate Professor and Professor level appointment / promotion; AND
- (ii) Candidates whose proposed appointment / promotion reside in an ACP.

3. CV

For the “**Top 10 Publications**” section of the CV:

- (i) Indicate the candidate’s role and contributions for each of the top 10 publications.
- (ii) Provide 3 - 5 sentences on the impact of the paper for each of the top 5 publications (e.g. how the findings in the publication had impacted the research field / medical practice / medical education / pedagogical approach, etc).

4. Intellectual Development Statement (IDS) [5 – 10 pages]

- (i) The onus is on the candidate to present the case compellingly with evidence and how the different pieces of evidence converge to support the case for promotion and / or award of tenure.
- (ii) The IDS should not be just bare-bone facts regurgitated from information that is already provided in the CV.
- (iii) The IDS must start by identifying the body of work that has made significant impact on the candidate’s standing and reputation in the field. The body of work must be described succinctly in concrete terms to demonstrate how impact has been recognized by the international peer community and / or industry, society, etc (if applicable).
- (iv) The description of specific contributions deemed impactful should be supported by multiple independent and convergent sources of evidence. The candidate is expected to provide the proper context to explain the significance of the evidence (e.g., funding support for an important invited talk/keynote, editorial board membership of the top journal in the field). The candidate is strongly advised to select the most significant evidence that would attract the attention of the referees, rather than providing a comprehensive list without emphasis and context to understand significance.
- (v) Below are **examples (what did you do, and why is it important and impactful)** of considerations that can guide the candidate to make a case for research impact and leadership:
 - Research productivity, activities, and accomplishments - besides describing your body of work, clearly demarcate which parts of your scholarly outputs and achievements are attributable to work conducted after your last appointment, promotion, and/or tenure

- Research impact in academia (e.g., citations), industry (e.g., patents and licensing of technology, competitive start-up funding, entrepreneurship), society, public policy, economy, environment, culture or other impact domains as appropriate
 - International research leadership in the field including but not restricted to awards, invited talks, keynotes, editorial board membership, conference program committees
 - Research independence from the Masters, PhD, post-doctoral thesis advisors and / or regular senior co-authors. Please provide a list of their names. Note: independence in developing a core body of work is ideally demonstrated through convergence of multiple indicators in the form of authorship, grantsmanship, graduate supervision, etc. The overall intent is to demonstrate primary ownership spanning origin of the creative ideas to bringing resources (grants, students, equipment, etc.) and intellectual leadership to realize these ideas in a concrete way to achieve quality outcomes (e.g., papers in top journals). The entire body of work may consist of this core and a collaborative body of work. Evidence of collaboration that expands the reach and impact of this core body of work is an advantage.
 - Holistic and relevant comparison with relevant peers of comparable standing in leading research universities that is aligned to measures of excellence broadly accepted in a discipline.
 - Provide a citation analysis to demonstrate research impact
 - Sustained upward research trajectory with significant progression from previous appointment, promotion, tenure
 - Future plans: plans and evidences for continuing development and expected significant contributions in the future.
 - others
- (vi) Below are **examples** of considerations that can guide the candidate to make a case for teaching impact and leadership with a focus on:
- (a) *self*: evidence of a range of educational activities and accomplishments made as a result of continuing development as a teacher after your last appointment or promotion
 - (b) *others*: evidence of accomplishments beyond the classroom, i.e., educational leadership (e.g., curriculum review, mentorship, awards, keynote invitations, key membership of high level education committees)
 - (c) *scholarship*: educational scholarship independent from or in collaboration with senior co-authors (e.g., education-related articles and / or presentations, textbook, innovative pedagogy and / or educational material, conference program committees, funded education projects)
 - (d) *future plans*: plans for continuing development, with significant progression from previous appointment or promotion and expected significant contributions in the future

5. Referee Requirements

- (i) Evaluation by referees form an integral part of the evaluation process. Referees should be carefully selected, as they must be able to comment in a discriminating and objective way on the candidate's current research and / or other professional work. The candidate should be informed that their nominated referees must be at adequate arm's length and to submit a statement declaring their relationships with their referees. A one-page biography of each referee

must be included. They should be from established reputable institutions, holding positions equivalent or higher in rank than that for which the candidate is being considered, and should be in active academic / professional service. Non-academic persons of comparable standing, such as senior research staff in reputable organizations or equivalent may also be selected as referees.

- (ii) Letters should ordinarily be solicited from referees who are in peer institutions or better. A general guideline may be 4 to 5 letters from **peer institutions** and 1 to 2 from **aspirant institutions**. It should be specified as to which letters are from peer institutions and which are from aspirant institutions. There may be referees who are not from a peer or an aspirant institution, but have a very high international reputation and impact in a field relevant to the candidate. This is allowable. Those nominating referees should explain their choice.

As a guide, the top 20 universities listed in the latest Times Higher Education (THE) World University Rankings can be referenced as aspirant institutions, while universities ranked from 21st to 100th can be referenced as peer institutions.

For tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, the referees should at least be at the Associate Professorial level. If Associate Professors are called upon to be referees, they must themselves be tenured. For promotion from Associate Professor to full Professor, the referees should be at the full Professorial level.

- (iii) It may also be beneficial to hear from collaborators and pre- and post-doctoral supervisors, e.g. about relative contributions to joint work: any such letters should be beyond the minimum of 6 required.

(iv) **A referee is NOT considered arm's length if he / she:**

- (a) had ever collaborated and / or published with the candidate, regardless of when that collaboration took place (e.g. even if it was 20 years ago).
- (b) is from an institution based in Singapore (e.g. NUS, NTU, SingHealth, National Healthcare Group, A*STAR, etc).
- (c) is from Duke University.
- (d) has personal connections with the candidate (e.g. former classmate, personal friend, etc).
- (e) had ever trained / mentored / supervised the candidate. Examples of such relationships include, but are not limited to, PhD / postdoctoral supervisor / advisor, etc.
- (f) ever had an employer-employee reporting relationship with the candidate.
- (g) had ever been colleagues with the candidate in the same institution.

(v) Appointment to Associate Professor or Professor with tenure

- (a) There must be 6 or more letters of evaluation from referees, with a minimum of 3 letters each from the respective lists of referees proposed by the candidate and the Search Committee.
- (b) Evaluations should not be obtained from referees with conflict of interest unless there are good reasons for doing so, such as to solicit inputs on the relative contributions in joint work. In such a case, the relationship between the candidate and the referee should be clearly disclosed, and any such letters should be beyond the minimum of six.
- (c) The candidate and the Search Committee shall each submit names of 6 possible referees to the SRP Director / ACP Chair. The Search Committee shall not duplicate the names from the candidate's list. The SRP Director / ACP Chair shall select an equal number of referees, minimum of 3, from each of the two lists submitted, and write to them for their evaluation of the candidate. The SRP Director / ACP Chair should avoid using more than one referee from each institution and referees who are no longer research-active. The SRP Director / ACP Chair may also request for additional names of referees from the Duke-NUS APT Committee and Dean to supplement the list from the Search Committee before he / she makes the selection. Additional referees may be added to the list in place of those who fail to respond or decline the task. The Duke-NUS APT Committee and the UPTC may also request additional letters of evaluation, if necessary.

(vi) Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor with tenure, or the award of tenure

- (a) There must be 6 or more letters of evaluation from referees, with a minimum of 3 letters each from the respective lists of external referees proposed by the candidate and the SRP / ACP NAC.
- (b) Evaluations should not be obtained from referees with conflict of interest unless there are good reasons for doing so, such as to solicit inputs on the relative contributions in joint work. In such a case, the relationship between the candidate and the referee should be clearly disclosed, and any such letters should be beyond the minimum of six.
- (c) The candidate and the SRP / ACP NAC shall each submit names of 6 possible referees to their Duke-NUS HOO. The NAC shall not duplicate the names from the candidate's list. The HOO shall select an equal number of referees, minimum of 3, from each of the two lists submitted. The HOO should avoid selecting referees who were previously referees in the candidate's earlier application for promotion and / or tenure, and avoid using more than one referee from each institution and referees who are no longer research-active. The SRP Director / ACP Chair shall write to them for their evaluation of the candidate. The HOO may also request for additional names of referees from the SRP Director / ACP Chair and / or Duke-NUS APT Committee to supplement the list from NAC before making the selection. The letters of evaluation from referees will be forwarded to the NAC upon receipt. Additional referees may be added to the list in place

of those who fail to respond or decline the task. The Duke-NUS APT Committee and the UPTC may also request additional letters of evaluation, if necessary.

6. Peer Research Benchmarking Report

- (i) Once there are enough referee letters, the Search Committee Chair or SRP / ACP NAC Chair should send an e-mail to Augustine Koh ([pvokcl@nus.edu.sg](mailto:pvlakl@nus.edu.sg)) of Office of Data and Intelligence (ODI) at NUS Office of the Senior Deputy President & Provost (PVO) with the following names:
 - (a) Candidate
 - (b) NUS faculty members (in related research area) who were promoted to the same rank and track as the candidate in the past 5 years
 - (c) Peers identified by the candidate (3 to 5 pax; optional for appointments)
 - (d) Peers identified by the Search Committee or SRP / ACP NAC (3 to 5 pax)
 - (e) Peers identified by the referees in their letters
 - (f) Names and institutions of the referees

Search Committee / NAC Chair to fill out the benchmarking template for submission to PVO ODI.

- (ii) The PVO ODI will conduct independent research benchmarking for all candidates for promotion and / or tenure and appointments through a systematic analytical process. The PVO ODI research benchmarking takes into consideration the comparable level of academic experience (e.g., rank, year of PhD, research community, etc.) of the candidate and peer comparators. It also makes more explicit reference to the peer and aspirant institutions identified in the endorsed department research benchmarking report, if any.
- (iii) ODI will only select additional comparators if less than 9 peer names were submitted or most of the peer names came from one source.

The criteria for ODI's selection are as follows:

- (a) Co-authors of the referees
- (b) Past doctoral students of the referees
- (c) Junior faculty members who work in the same university and department as the referees

Should ODI again fail to obtain enough peers, they will find additional peer researchers from the cognate departments of the following universities:

- (1) Peer and aspirant universities according to the Endorsed Department Research Benchmarking report
- (2) For departments that do not have endorsed department research benchmarking reports, ODI will identify peer and aspirant universities by referring to the Times Higher Education (THE) ranking and QS Subject Ranking in the subject areas of the candidate

In all cases, the peers are selected only if they graduated around the same time as the candidate (+/- 5 years approximately) and currently hold the position to which the candidate is applying.

ODI will generate the benchmarking bibliometrics from Scopus, SciVal and NUS Elements and write a report with their analysis. ODI will send the benchmarking report that explains their methodology and analysis to the Search Committee Chair or SRP / ACP NAC Chair upon completion. The entire process will take 2 weeks from the date of submission of the peer names to ODI by the Search Committee / NAC Chair.

Rank 2022	Rank 2021	Institution	Country/region	Teaching	Research	Citations	Industry income	International outlook	Overall score
1	1	University of Oxford	United Kingdom	91.0	99.6	98.0	74.4	96.3	95.7
=2	4	California Institute of Technology	United States	93.6	96.9	97.8	90.4	83.8	95.0
=2	3	Harvard University	United States	94.5	98.9	99.2	48.9	79.8	95.0
4	2	Stanford University	United States	92.3	96.8	99.9	91.0	79.7	94.9
=5	6	University of Cambridge	United Kingdom	90.9	99.5	96.2	56.7	95.8	94.6
=5	5	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	United States	90.9	94.4	99.7	93.7	89.9	94.6
7	9	Princeton University	United States	89.5	96.0	99.0	88.8	80.7	93.6
8	7	University of California, Berkeley	United States	85.7	96.0	99.1	84.7	77.6	92.2
9	8	Yale University	United States	90.7	93.0	97.0	56.2	69.9	90.8
10	10	The University of Chicago	United States	87.2	90.6	98.3	56.3	74.4	89.8
11	17	Columbia University	United States	87.8	89.6	97.3	48.0	79.8	89.6
12	11	Imperial College London	United Kingdom	80.8	88.4	97.6	70.8	97.5	89.1
=13	12	Johns Hopkins University	United States	80.0	90.8	97.2	93.7	74.6	88.4
=13	13	University of Pennsylvania	United States	84.5	89.2	97.1	77.6	69.7	88.4
15	14	ETH Zurich	Switzerland	81.3	92.4	90.7	62.5	97.9	88.2
=16	23	Peking University	China	91.4	94.6	81.7	93.1	65.1	87.5
=16	=20	Tsinghua University	China	88.1	95.7	86.8	100.0	50.6	87.5
=18	18	University of Toronto	Canada	77.6	93.0	92.6	61.2	89.1	87.2
=18	16	UCL	United Kingdom	76.8	88.9	96.9	44.7	96.7	87.2
20	15	University of California, Los Angeles	United States	82.1	89.8	96.0	56.5	65.1	86.7
21	25	National University of Singapore	Singapore	76.3	90.6	87.3	75.4	94.4	85.2
22	19	Cornell University	United States	78.6	85.4	97.2	38.3	75.4	85.0
23	=20	Duke University	United States	79.2	78.6	95.6	99.0	66.6	83.5
=24	22	University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	United States	78.6	85.4	94.0	48.9	59.5	83.1
=24	24	Northwestern University	United States	74.3	82.1	97.6	81.6	65.3	83.1
26	26	New York University	United States	75.4	83.1	94.7	41.4	72.3	82.4
27	27	London School of Economics and Political Science	United Kingdom	68.0	80.8	94.4	35.8	92.7	80.8
28	28	Carnegie Mellon University	United States	64.7	80.0	99.0	59.0	80.8	80.6
29	29	University of Washington	United States	68.8	78.8	99.0	46.3	61.7	79.8
=30	30	University of Edinburgh	United Kingdom	66.1	74.2	95.6	40.2	95.2	78.9
=30	39	University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong	66.2	72.2	95.0	58.5	98.8	78.9
32	32	LMU Munich	Germany	68.1	77.9	90.3	100.0	69.1	78.6
33	31	University of Melbourne	Australia	67.5	73.8	88.4	74.9	94.0	77.8
34	33	University of California, San Diego	United States	60.5	75.6	97.9	96.6	68.1	77.7
=35	35	King's College London	United Kingdom	57.6	71.2	96.9	43.7	95.9	76.0
=35	=36	The University of Tokyo	Japan	86.9	90.3	58.2	88.1	42.0	76.0
37	34	University of British Columbia	Canada	61.6	74.0	89.4	47.4	94.9	75.8
38	41	Technical University of Munich	Germany	64.5	74.8	85.5	100.0	76.1	75.6
39	=36	Karolinska Institute	Sweden	55.1	71.0	94.2	70.5	86.2	74.3
=40	43	École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne	Switzerland	63.8	67.0	85.5	74.9	98.3	74.1
=40	46	Paris Sciences et Lettres - PSL Research University Paris	France	69.1	71.2	80.1	78.7	80.5	74.1
=42	42	Heidelberg University	Germany	67.9	59.9	95.5	54.2	69.6	73.6
=42	45	KU Leuven	Belgium	59.1	73.2	86.2	99.2	74.2	73.6
44	40	McGill University	Canada	63.3	70.9	83.9	45.3	91.5	73.4
45	38	Georgia Institute of Technology	United States	58.2	69.4	91.4	71.4	77.7	73.3
46	47	Nanyang Technological University, Singapore	Singapore	57.2	70.3	85.1	87.0	93.9	73.0
47	44	University of Texas at Austin	United States	67.9	71.5	89.4	50.1	39.8	72.9
48	48	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	United States	65.7	77.3	80.9	50.0	55.4	72.6
49	=56	Chinese University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong	55.1	58.6	95.0	60.2	95.0	71.3
50	=51	University of Manchester	United Kingdom	56.4	65.0	89.1	45.6	92.4	71.2

Rank 2022	Rank 2021	Institution	Country/region	Teaching	Research	Citations	Industry income	International outlook	Overall score
51	50	Washington University in St Louis	United States	60.5	57.5	98.5	44.9	62.1	70.7
52	=56	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	United States	62.2	63.4	95.6	45.0	41.1	70.6
53	=62	Wageningen University & Research	Netherlands	50.1	58.1	95.6	100.0	86.4	70.1
=54	59	Australian National University	Australia	49.8	67.7	87.8	47.8	96.5	70.0
=54	=62	The University of Queensland	Australia	55.0	62.0	85.8	86.2	93.4	70.0
=54	60	Seoul National University	South Korea	73.8	73.8	68.5	98.2	36.9	70.0
57	=64	Monash University	Australia	54.3	61.7	87.7	79.2	91.0	69.9
=58	=51	University of Sydney	Australia	51.8	62.2	90.5	66.1	90.9	69.8
=58	49	University of Wisconsin-Madison	United States	67.4	69.5	79.2	47.5	50.4	69.8
60	=70	Fudan University	China	66.8	68.4	79.0	70.7	48.6	69.7
61	=54	Kyoto University	Japan	78.5	78.9	58.3	80.8	38.2	69.6
62	=54	Boston University	United States	57.3	60.2	93.8	46.5	65.5	69.5
63	53	University of Southern California	United States	62.1	58.8	90.3	41.2	65.5	69.3
64	61	Brown University	United States	62.2	56.6	92.9	37.4	61.9	69.1
65	66	University of Amsterdam	Netherlands	49.0	63.3	91.6	41.6	89.8	68.9
66	=56	The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology	Hong Kong	50.9	62.1	86.6	65.1	97.6	68.8
67	=64	University of California, Davis	United States	58.8	64.6	81.5	50.7	68.9	67.9
68	68	University of California, Santa Barbara	United States	45.2	58.9	96.6	79.8	73.6	67.7
69	=75	Utrecht University	Netherlands	46.6	63.1	90.1	77.0	76.3	67.6
70	67	UNSW Sydney	Australia	50.4	60.4	84.1	72.7	95.2	67.4
71	=70	Leiden University	Netherlands	44.8	65.1	86.8	71.8	84.1	67.1
72	72	Erasmus University Rotterdam	Netherlands	40.2	57.8	97.0	76.5	88.5	67.0
73	=75	Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin	Germany	48.6	50.6	98.7	92.2	68.1	66.8
74	=80	Humboldt University of Berlin	Germany	59.9	66.7	73.5	41.6	70.1	66.3
=75	=78	Delft University of Technology	Netherlands	57.1	71.1	59.4	97.7	93.6	65.8
=75	=94	Zhejiang University	China	67.2	69.9	58.6	100.0	61.6	65.8
=75	=73	University of Zurich	Switzerland	52.2	49.6	89.4	61.9	92.5	65.8
=78	=78	University of Tübingen	Germany	53.3	58.7	82.9	82.7	65.2	65.4
=78	77	University of Warwick	United Kingdom	46.9	53.0	90.7	44.8	94.5	65.4
=80	=80	University of Groningen	Netherlands	42.5	55.3	90.6	81.1	88.7	65.2
=80	69	McMaster University	Canada	44.3	50.6	93.1	98.3	85.1	65.2
82	=85	Emory University	United States	55.1	44.9	98.1	48.2	59.7	65.1
83	=118	Free University of Berlin	Germany	55.4	65.2	72.9	41.9	75.7	64.8
84	100	Shanghai Jiao Tong University	China	64.2	71.9	59.3	100.0	47.0	64.7
85	=80	Ohio State University (Main campus)	United States	54.7	52.2	86.1	53.2	60.6	63.8
=86	=92	University of Glasgow	United Kingdom	41.9	49.9	94.0	40.7	93.1	63.7
=86	=85	University of Minnesota	United States	55.9	57.9	81.7	80.4	40.8	63.7
=88	=73	University of Montreal	Canada	50.4	52.9	81.7	69.5	85.7	63.6
=88	=87	University of Science and Technology of China	China	63.4	61.5	72.8	70.3	34.5	63.6
=88	=87	Sorbonne University	France	61.0	53.6	76.6	38.2	70.4	63.6
91	129	Hong Kong Polytechnic University	Hong Kong	45.4	53.9	83.7	46.0	97.1	63.3
92	91	University of Bristol	United Kingdom	40.6	49.2	94.7	43.7	89.1	63.1
=93	90	University of Maryland, College Park	United States	49.3	56.8	89.8	39.3	42.9	63.0
=93	105	Michigan State University	United States	58.1	56.1	77.2	37.7	62.0	63.0
95	NR	Institut Polytechnique de Paris	France	56.4	54.4	69.0	77.1	94.5	62.9
=96	84	University of Copenhagen	Denmark	46.8	47.1	88.8	54.4	86.8	62.7
=96	=103	Ghent University	Belgium	48.9	58.4	79.2	83.3	62.4	62.7
98	=98	University of California, Irvine	United States	42.5	49.0	93.8	52.0	73.2	62.4
=99	=101	Dartmouth College	United States	60.1	40.2	93.6	38.9	41.7	62.3
=99	96	Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST)	South Korea	64.1	66.5	59.3	100.0	38.0	62.3

Source	Name	Current Institution	Department	Promotion		PhD		URL
				Year	Title	Year	School	
Candidate	Adrian Koh Soo Jin	NUS			Assoc Prof	2008	NUS	
NUS peer promoted recently								
NUS peer promoted recently								
NUS peer promoted recently								
Peer identified by P&T*candidate								
Peer identified by P&T candidate								
Peer identified by P&T candidate								
Peer identified by SC*/DEC *								
Peer identified by SC/DEC								
Peer identified by SC/DEC								
Peer identified by the ER *								
Peer identified by the ER								
Peer identified by the ER								
ER selected by Dean (or Head for appt)								
ER selected by Dean (or Head for appt)								
ER selected by Dean (or Head for appt)								
ER selected by Dean (or Head for appt)								
ER selected by Dean (or Head for appt)								

* Please refer to the Legend below

<u>NUS Legend</u>	<u>Duke-NUS Equivalent</u>
SC: Search Committee	SC: Search Committee
DEC: Department Evaluation Committee	NAC: Nomination and Appointment Committee
ER: NUS External Reviewer	ER: External Referee
P&T: Promotion & Tenure	P&T: Promotion & Tenure



G:\ADD\Faculty Website\Peer Benchmarking

Proposed Appointment	Name	Current Institution	Department	PhD		Scopus ID	H-Index (current)	All Publications (SciVal) - 1996 to current					Articles - 1996 to current				First/Last/Corresponding Publications - 1996 to current				FLC Articles - 1996 to current				URL		
				Year	School			# Papers	FWCI	% Top 10% Journals	# Top 10% Journals	Publication: Highest FWCI and Year	# Papers	FWCI	% Top 10% Journals	# Top 10% Journals	# Papers	FWCI	% Top 10% Journals	# Top 10% Journals	Publication: Highest FWCI and Year	# Papers	FWCI	% Top 10% Journals		# Top 10% Journals	
	Candidate																										