**2013 Mentor-of-the-Year Award**

Having a good mentor (or two) is essential for moving forward in your science career. In 2012, Dr. William Hahn was selected by the Postdoctoral and Graduate Student Association to receive the first annual DFCI Mentor-of-the-Year Award in recognition of his exceptional mentoring. Dr. Hahn used the prize money to take his lab bowling! On June 28, 2013, he will be giving a lecture to share his advice and experiences with mentoring.

We encourage you to submit a nomination. Please write a one-page statement that describes your mentor’s qualifications and explains why you think he/she should receive the award. Last year, the nominations that stood out provided specific, detailed examples of how the mentor had a positive impact on advancing the mentee’s research career. Points to describe might be the networking opportunities and career guidance provided by your mentor and the quality of communication that you have with him/her. Note that the nominee does not have to be your current research advisor, but he/she must be a current DFCI faculty member. Nominations should be submitted by individual mentees, not by a group of people or an entire lab, and we ask that you only nominate one individual, one time. Previous recipients of this award are currently ineligible for re-nomination. Please visit http://dfcionline.org/departments/pgsao/mentor-of-the-year/ to submit your nomination statement by Thursday, August 15, 2013. Don’t delay – take this opportunity to nominate your favorite mentor today!

**ORTV Wants Your Research Photos!**

How many hours have you spent hunched over a microscope, taking hundreds of photos just to get that one “perfect” figure for your manuscript? Do you have dozens of unused images that are just clogging up your desktop and that have never seen the light of day? Why not get some use out of those extra images?

The DFCI Office of Research and Technology Ventures (ORTV) wants to feature your great research photographs on their new external webpage, as a way to showcase the cutting-edge science being carried out by Dana-Farber investigators. Once the website is launched, research photos will appear on the main page and will be accompanied by brief captions to acknowledge all contributors and their PI/lab. So this initiative will also benefit you, by giving your expertise and research findings some additional exposure and recognition.

If you would like to contribute an image, please send your favorite photo to ortv@dfci.harvard.edu, along with a short description of the content for the caption. Images should be of high quality and resolution (JPEG preferred), and may be in black and white or in color. All photographs submitted for consideration must arise from your DFCI-related research. We ask that you not submit photographs from a published paper, or images that you plan to include in a manuscript to be published in the future.

Do you know where this is? Send your answer to dfci_pgapost@dfci.harvard.edu. The first 2 people with the correct answer will receive a $5 gift card!
What skills or personality traits contribute most to your success at your job?

It is important to be flexible and to quickly adapt to business needs. Academia affords one the ability to dive deeply into a specific area, but in biotech, the pace is faster and business needs can be varied (i.e., one might be working on a number of different disease areas or compounds simultaneously).

What do you enjoy most about your job?

I absolutely enjoy and thrive on the diversity of my role. I have had the unique opportunity to work on projects from the discovery phase through clinical development since I first entered biotech. It is rewarding to be fully engaged in such a broad spectrum of activities.

What problems and challenges does someone in your role face?

Work-life balance is a challenge in a biotech start-up. It’s important to learn not to burn the candle at both ends all the time, so that you have reserve energy to tap into when needed. Each person’s lifestyle and personality will dictate how to best deal with this challenge. For me, I leave my cell phone in another room or turn it off completely while having dinner. I try not to check e-mails on my phone before going to work unless I have a pending deadline or emergency. While these may seem like simple steps, these adjustments can be very challenging for those who have difficulty “shutting down.” I think it also helps if you are able to leave the office for the day having accomplished a critical task/project.

What specific steps did you take to find your current job?

I found my current position through a colleague with whom I worked in a previous company. This is a great example of how building and fostering relationships is important.

How has your DFCI training influenced your career?

My training at DFCI has been a great asset. Being part of the forward-thinking science at DFCI certainly catapulted me to the next level. My PI was a phenomenal leader who inspired creativity by providing the lab with opportunities to engage in scientific discussions and collaborations with the Broad Institute at MIT and with both biotech and pharmaceutical companies. I also participated in a series of postdoc industry luncheons organized by Drs. Don Kufe and Bill Kaelin. The networking connections I made at one of those luncheons actually led to my first industry job.

What advice would you give to current postdocs looking to transition into industry?

It goes without saying that anyone interested in transitioning to industry should learn all they can about the field, including the dynamics across all functional groups, not just the science-related positions. A good understanding of how each group contributes to the success of other groups and the mission of the whole company is important. Finding a mentor within industry is also helpful, because he or she can provide meaningful insight into where your skill set may best fit and how to market yourself for specific positions. I would also encourage postdocs to get involved in biotech networking organizations in the area.
Impact Factor: The Right Metric for Scientific Quality?

Precise assessment of scientific quality can be difficult. Currently, the scientific community largely evaluates the quality of a paper on the basis of the impact factor (IF) of the journal in which it was published. Created in the 1970s, the IF served as a useful tool that was employed by research libraries to measure the relative importance of an academic journal within a particular field. The IF of a journal represents the average number of times that articles published in the journal were cited within the last two years.

Although the idea of defining an IF began with the best intentions, the formula used for calculating the IF does not always capture a journal’s true impact on the scientific world. In fact, studies have shown that less than 15% of the articles in a journal can account for half of the total citations for that journal. This finding is troublesome because it means that a few great articles can skew the IF calculation such that the majority of articles published in that journal are overvalued, while the few important articles may not get the full credit that they deserve; thus the IF can lead to a misjudgment of the actual performance of the journal as a whole.

Nevertheless, the IF is still commonly used by the scientific community and has given rise to a subjective ranking of journals that can be misleading. The most cited journals, including Science, Nature and Cell, publish results that represent major advances and cover large areas of basic research; interestingly, studies in these top-ranked journals often come from rich or famous laboratories. In contrast, most specialized journals, including those that publish clinical reviews, by definition have the lowest IF because they are read and cited only by specialists in a particular field, even though they may feature studies that have scientific rigor and appeal equal to those in more highly cited journals.

Furthermore, the IF not only estimates the merits of the journals themselves, but it undeniably affects the perceived worth of the people who are publishing in these journals, as it represents a standardized (though biased) metric that is often used to compare scientists’ accomplishments when they apply for funding opportunities or future jobs. This is precisely what makes the IF so problematic, because scientific society measures scientific competency by an index of popularity, and scientific teams, as well as individual scientists, are frequently judged on the basis of the IFs of journals where they have published. While the IF clearly does provide some utility for researching and assessing scientific literature, it should not be the exclusive index by which scientific quality is evaluated and quantified.


A Networking Site for Scientists

I joined ResearchGate (RG) when two of my mentors from graduate school invited me to join this social networking site for scientists. It seemed like a great way to keep up with my mentors’ research by following their profiles.

As a baseline for building my own profile, RG organized all of my publications, showing the abstract, journal impact score, and pdf thumbnails. I could add as little or as much background about myself as I wanted, set up my topics of interest, and follow other researchers’ profiles. In the set-up options, I could choose how much of this information to display to the public or to other RG members. I could restrict certain types of e-mails from RG, which I recommend since there is a feed on the homepage that contains much of the same information. I had the option to receive e-mail updates about people I follow when they had a new publication or made updates to their profiles. I also could receive e-mail updates on the number of other RG member researchers at Dana-Farber and in my department, and invitations to follow RG members who were following me.

One of the strengths of RG compared to other academic networking sites (such as Academia.edu or Mendeley) is a rich interaction among members in topic forums, with questions and answers for how to do or interpret something. An “RG score” assesses how others interact with my profile by number of views, pdf downloads, and responses to questions and answers. RG currently does not display vendor ads but does feature ads for jobs in a separate section.

Overall I find RG is a good site for building a professional profile and for networking with other researchers in my field. A number of postdocs and senior scientists from Dana-Farber and other top quality cancer research institutions in Boston and around the world are on RG, so it is a useful tool to build our research community with a net that is as closely knit or as far flung as we choose.

Websites:
www.ResearchGate.net
www.Academia.edu

Special thanks to Jennifer Molina and Sonal Jhaveri.
If you are interested in contributing to the PGA Newsletter, email us at dfci_pgapost@dfci.harvard.edu
Comments and suggestions are also welcomed!
**Curiosity Corner**

Have you ever wondered how people come up with their experimental protocols? Or what the rationale is for a specific step in their methodologies? Well, wonder no more! Some scientists recently started a hashtag #overlyhonestmethods on Twitter to reveal the secret sauce in their methods. Here are some examples:

- **Biological Need** by @pedmills: We incubated this for however long lunch was.
- **God’s Will** by @AdrianaHeguy: We used a modified method with a longer incubation step because the subways were not running after Hurricane Sandy.
- **Life Choices** by @MrEpid: We don’t know how the results were obtained. The postdoc who did all the work has since left to start a bakery; and @researchremix: The data is old because in between writing the first draft and doing the revisions I had a baby.
- **Culture Shock** by @AnneOsterrieder: We don’t know how this method was performed because the PhD student’s lab book is written in a foreign language; and @easternblot: We added 888 uL because it’s a lucky number in China.
- **Intellectual Superiority** by @eperlste: We used jargon instead of plain English to prove that a decade of grad school and postdoc made us smart.

Supplementary Methods and Materials can be found at goo.gl/HZIRO and goo.gl/rV716, or on Twitter.

---

**Ask Jen!**

Have a question or comment about postdoc or grad student life at Dana-Farber? Email the PGSAO at dfci_pgsao@dfci.harvard.edu or the PGA at dfci_pga@dfci.harvard.edu.

**Q: Is the Industry Exploration Program still running – and if so, how do I sign up?**

A: Yes, we are still participating in the IEP! Many postdocs at Dana-Farber are interested in pursuing careers outside of academia, and so the PGSAO strives to provide resources such as the IEP to help support this transition.

For those who have not heard about this program, here is a brief background. In March 2012, Dana-Farber joined Massachusetts General Hospital, Brigham and Women’s Hospital, and Boston University School of Medicine to participate in the Industry Exploration Program (IEP). This initiative is a partnership between these institutions and MassBioEd Foundation, which was established to forge ties between the Boston biotech community and academia. The IEP provides postdocs the opportunity to get a first hand look at how pharma and biotech companies operate by touring their facilities, learning about their hiring process and company culture, meeting with top scientists and potentially building future collaborations. Since the program’s inception, 14 Dana-Farber postdocs have been selected to visit New England BioLabs, Amgen, Cubist and Merrimack Pharmaceuticals. MassBioEd is always recruiting new companies (we hear that a Pfizer visit is in the works!), so this list will continue to expand over the coming year. Once a company has agreed to host an IEP visit, they use a key-word search on the IEP website to identify postdocs with interests matching those of their company, and then the PGSAO extends invitations to the selected postdocs to attend the visitation day.

Signing up for the program is easy, and any postdoc at Dana-Farber is eligible to participate. The process for applying includes creating a profile and uploading a 250-word biosketch on the IEP website at [http://postdoc.massbioed.org/](http://postdoc.massbioed.org/), obtaining your PI’s signature on a PI consent form, completing Intellectual Property training, and passing a short online quiz on this training. You may view more details pertaining to the program on the PGSAO’s intranet site at [http://dfcionline.org/departments/pgsao/career-development/iep/](http://dfcionline.org/departments/pgsao/career-development/iep/), where you can view the IEP presentation and Intellectual Property training videos and find the link to take the Intellectual Property quiz. Register for the program today, and you may be selected to attend the next company visit!