The Principal of King’s College London asked the Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience (IoPPN) to set up a committee to examine publications authored by Professor Hans Eysenck with Professor Ronald Grossarth-Maticek.

Professor Eysenck left the employment of the Institute of Psychiatry (IoP) in 1983 and is now deceased. Professor Grossarth-Maticek is listed as associated with the University of Heidelberg. A letter written by Professor Stuart Checkley (Checkley 1993) informed the committee that although Prof Eysenck was employed at the IoP, Professor Grossarth-Maticek had never been employed as an academic at the IoP despite this appearing as his affiliation on many of the papers. We have therefore not investigated any papers where Grossarth-Maticek was an author if the paper was not jointly authored by an employee of the IoP.

The purpose of the committee is to ascertain (as far as possible) that the joint publications were safe in terms of presenting scientifically rigorous results relating personality factors with cancer, coronary heart disease, and other outcomes. The chair of the committee was independent of King’s College London and the IoPPN.

The committee considered all the articles in peer review journals where the two authors appeared together and analysed data relevant to personality and physical health outcomes. There were two main types of papers, reports of observational cohort studies and those describing the impact of a specific type of psychological treatment developed by Grossarth-Maticek. Several papers report on data...
from one or the other or both, and the committee took the view that they would investigate general issues on both types of studies that had been discussed in the literature.

1. The observational reports were based on a large data set collected from the residents of Crvenka, Yugoslavia in the late 1960s and early 1970s, together with cohort studies conducted in Heidelberg, Germany in the 1970s and 1980s. Both were followed up for 15-20 years. The primary focus was on whether specially devised measures of personality could predict the development of cancer, coronary heart disease and all-cause mortality. The data were also used to examine factors such as alcohol, coffee and soft drink consumption, physical activity and smoking in relation to survival (see Appendix for list of papers).

2. The interventional reports are based on the impact of a therapy programme variously called Creative Novation Behaviour Therapy or ‘Maudsley Intervention’ administered in individual or group-based formats, or as a form of bibliotherapy based on written text. The committee did not have access to any data but have carried out an assessment based on the current literature which includes peer reviewed papers and reviews from critics as well as from collaborators. We also identified some attempted replications of the results either from data available on the jointly authored studies or new studies (for example, Amelang, SchmidtRathjens et al. 1996, Amelang 1997).

Assessment

The same Checkley letter (see above) informed the committee that the studies cited or described in the jointly authored papers had not been considered by an ethics committee at the IoP. They were also not part of the strategy of the joint research committee of the Institute of Psychiatry and the Maudsley Hospital. It is therefore not possible to review a protocol or an ethical assessment of the studies described. We do not know if they were reviewed by another ethics committee.

Concerns about this body of research were raised as early as the late 1980s. An entire issue of Psychological Inquiry (1991, Vol 2, part 3) was devoted to critiques from leading authorities in psycho-oncology and medical statistics, and the issues have been cogently summarized by Pelosi and Appleby (1993) and Pelosi (in press). The concerns are based on two issues. First, the validity of the datasets, in terms of recruitment of participants, administration of measures, reliability of outcome ascertainment, biases in data collection, absence of relevant covariates, and selection of cases analysed in each article. Second, the implausibility of the results presented, many of which show effect sizes virtually unknown in medical science. For example, the relative risk of dying of cancer for individuals with ‘cancer-prone’ personality compared with healthy personality was over 100, while the risk of cancer mortality was reduced 80% by bibliotherapy. These findings are incompatible with modern clinical science and the understanding of disease processes.

We have not identified replications of the intervention studies but attempts to replicate the personality effects have not found the same or even similar results (e.g. Amelang 1997; Amelang et al 1996).

The Committee shared the concerns made by the critics of this body of work. We have come to the conclusion that we consider the published results of studies that included the results of the analyses of data collected as part of the intervention or observational studies to be unsafe and that the editors of the journals should be informed of our decision. We have highlighted 26 papers (Appendix 1) which
were published in 11 journals which are still in existence (see list of journals and editors Appendix 2). We recommend that the Principal write to the editors of these journals to inform them that, based on our enquiry, we consider the results and conclusions of these studies are unsafe.

The Director of Research Governance, Ethics and Integrity at King’s has written to the academic lead for research misconduct at the University of Heidelberg to confirm Professor Ronald Grossarth-Maticek’s affiliation with them at the time in question, and to clarify their procedure for investigating allegations of research misconduct.
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Addresses of Editors of journal that published potentially unsafe results

Professor Roger Pearson (Editor)
Journal of Social, Political, and Economic Studies
Council for Social and Economic Studies
PO Box 34143
Washington DC 20043, USA

and is responsible for reference 1.

Michelle G. Craske (Editor) Behaviour Research and Therapy Department of Psychology
University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) 405 Hilgard Avenue,
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1563 California, USA

and is responsible for references 2, 3, 5, 12

Dr Donald Saklofske
Personality and Individual Differences
Department of Psychology University of Western Ontario Canada

and is responsible for references, 14, 22, 25, 27

Jaan Valsiner (Editor-in-Chief)
Intergrative Psychological and Behavioral Science
Department of Psychology Clark University

Professor Emeritus John D Ball (Editor)
Perceptual and Motor Skills
Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences Eastern Virginia Medical School
Norfolk USA

and is responsible for references 24 and 26

Associate Professor Cory R. Scherer (Editor) Psychological Reports
Department of Psychology Pennsylvania State University Penn State

and is responsible for references 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16 and 17

Professor Oi Ling Siu (Editor)
International Journal of Stress Management
WYL201/1
Dorothy Y L Wong Building Department of Applied Psychology Lingnan University
Tuen Mun Hong Kong

and is responsible for reference 19

Werner Strik (Editor)
Neuropsychobiology
University Hospital of Psychiatry Waldau
and is responsible for reference 7

Adam S. Radomsky (Editor)  
Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry  
L-PY 101-4  
Psychology Building 7141 Sherbrooke W.  
Concordia University in Montreal Canada

and is responsible for reference 10

Timothy R Elliott (Editor) Journal of Clinical Psychology  
Education & Human Development Texas A&M University  
713A Harrington Office Building

and is responsible for references 20 and 21

Ying Hwa kee & Lambros Lazuras (Co Editors) International Journal of Sport Psychology  
Edizioni Luigi Pozzi s.r.l. Via Panama 68 - 00198  
Roma, Italy

and is responsible for reference 23