

Annex I to the Rules of Procedure of the Commission for Research Integrity: Guidelines for the investigation of alleged scientific misconduct

Preface

The guidelines set forth below are largely based on Sections I and II of the “Regulations relating to good scientific practice” published by the University of Vienna in its Info Sheet for the 2005-2006 academic year (Issue 15 of January 31, 2006)

I. Safeguarding good scientific practice

§ 1 General

(1) The following demands should be satisfied by good scientific practice::

1. Investigations must be performed according to the rules of the relevant discipline (*lege artis*). In this context, knowledge of the current state of research and of appropriate methods is indispensable.
2. The maintenance of precise records and documentation of scientific procedures and results is essential to experimental work, as reproducibility is a key characteristic of this type of research. The methods used and the results obtained must be documented. Primary data must be stored reliably and retained for a period of ten years.
3. Results must be questioned consistently and critically. Openness to criticism and doubts expressed by colleagues and co-workers is an integral part of this process, as is the careful, disinterested and unbiased review of colleagues' work and refusal to review work in the case of a conflict of interests.
4. Scientific results should be made available to the scientific community by means of publications. Thus – like a scientific observation or a scientific experiment itself – scientific publications also represent a form of documentation of the results of scientists' work.
5. Strict honesty must be maintained with regard to the contributions of partners and of competitors. The work of competitors must not be hampered or obstructed.
6. The fundamental principles of scientific work as recognised in the individual scientific disciplines are to be observed. Thus originality and quality should always be given preference over quantity, especially in examinations and in awarding academic titles, in hiring staff and appointing professors as well as in the assessment of research performance.

§ 2 Authorship of scientific publications

- (1) If several persons are involved in a research project or in writing a scientific report, persons should be included as co-authors if they contributed significantly to conceiving the topic of investigation or the research plan, if they contributed to the performance of the research project or to the evaluation or interpretation of the results, or if they contributed to drafting the manuscript or made important suggestions for its revision.
- (2) Purely technical participation in data collection, providing financial support or simply heading the department in which the research is undertaken does not constitute a valid basis for co-authorship. The same applies to merely proofreading a manuscript without making an intellectual contribution to its content.
- (3) In agreeing to be named as a co-author, a scientist or scholar accepts joint responsibility for ensuring that the publication satisfies the demands of good scientific practice. This mainly applies to the area in which the co-author contributed. Co-authors are responsible both for the correctness of their contributions and for ensuring that their contributions are included in the publication in a scientifically acceptable manner.
- (4) If individual scientists are named as co-authors of a publication without their consent and if they are (after the fact) unwilling to agree to being named as co-authors, it is expected that they will raise explicit objections

against being named as co-authors to the person primarily responsible for the publication, to the editorial office of the journal in question, and to the publisher.

§ 3 Junior scientists and researchers

(1) Junior scientists and researchers commence scientific work at the latest when they begin their master's/diploma thesis and/or doctoral dissertation. In addition to teaching these young scientists and researchers the appropriate methods, the organisations supporting scholarly research must convey to them a basic ethical attitude toward scientific work, toward dealing with results in a responsible manner, and toward working together with other scholars.

(2) Young scientists and researchers have the right to regular scientific supervision, advising and support.

II. Scientific misconduct

§ 4 Scientific misconduct by scientists and researchers

The following events or acts constitute cases of scientific misconduct:

1. Deliberate or grossly negligent inclusion of false information in a scientific context. The specific circumstances of each individual case shall be decisive. In particular, false information includes the following:

- a) Fabrication of data;
- b) Falsification of data, e.g.
 - i. by omitting unwanted results without disclosing such omissions;
 - ii. by manipulating representations or depictions;
- c) Provision of incorrect information in an application for employment or for funding (including inaccurate information relating to forms of publication or to forthcoming publications);
- d) Incorrect assertions that submitted work has been checked by (certain) scientific experts;
- e) A recommendation to publish the work of others without having checked it.

2. Violations of the intellectual property of other scientists. In particular, such violations are considered to occur in the following cases:

- a) Unauthorised exploitation following a claim of authorship (plagiarism);
- b) Exploitation of the research approaches and ideas of others, especially if they are gathered as a result of refereeing activity (theft of ideas);
- c) Claiming or acceptance of unjustified authorship or co-authorship of a scientific work;
- d) Unauthorised publication and unauthorised provision of access to a work, discovery, hypothesis, theory or research approach to third parties before it has been published by its author;

3. Deliberate or grossly negligent obstruction of the research work of other scientists, as well as thoughtless and dishonest attempts to lower the scientific reputation of another scientist;

4. Sabotaging research activities (including damaging, destroying or manipulating experiments, equipment, documents, hardware, software, chemicals or other materials that another scientist requires to undertake his or her research);

5. Destruction of primary data or violation of the record-keeping and documentation requirements pursuant to Art. 1 Par. 1 No. 2.

§ 5 Joint responsibility for misconduct

In the following cases (among others), a party may be found jointly responsible for misconduct:

1. Participation in others' misconduct;
2. Being an accessory to falsifications by others;

3. Co-authoring publications which contain falsifications;
4. Gross neglect of supervisory responsibilities.