SOME THOUGHTS ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY
Boris Yudin
(Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia)

2nd World Conference on Research Integrity

Singapore, 21-24 July 2010

- **To detect** cases of research misconduct
- **To react** on these cases
- **To develop policies** to cope with researc misconduct
- **To understand** current situation tendencies and in research practice. Why phenomena of research misconduct become more and more widespread?

- In 2010 the project aimed at elaboration of Ethical Code for scientists from Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) had started.
- The project is headed by prof. R. Apressyan (Moscow).
- It is supported by UNESCO's Moscow Bureau.

- CIS includes most of the post-Soviet states. These countries have many common traits, such as cultural traditions (including research culture), wide proliferation of the Russian language etc.
- [See, for example: O. Kubar et al. Common ethical and legal aspects in the field of biology and medicine // Ethical review of biomedical research in CIS countries (social and cultural aspects). St.-Petersburg, 2007.]

- At the first stage of the project we prepared a questionnaire which was distributed among some researchers and science managers in CIS countries.

- Below are some items proposed in the questionnaire.

Do you think that the following misuses must be pointed out in the Code:

- *plagiarism*

- *false co-authorship*

- *fabrication of data*

- *falsification of data.*

Who must develop standards of responsible conduct of research:

- *scientific community as such*
- *experts*
- *professional scientific associations*
- *national academies of sciences*
- *appropriate ministries and agencies*
- *international scientific organizations.*

Who must monitor compliance with standards of responsible conduct of research:

- *scientists*
- *administrative bodies of national academy of sciences*
- *ethical committees of national academy of sciences*
- *scientific councils of the university or research institute*
- *ethical committees of the university or research institute*
- *administrative bodies of the university or research institute*
- *authorized departments of appropriate ministries and agencies*
- *professional scientific associations.*

Who must inspect quality of research results:

- *scientists*
- *administrative bodies of the university or research institute*
- *ethical committees of national academy of sciences*
- *scientific councils of the university or research institute*
- *ethical committees of the university or research institute*
- *mass-media, journalists*
- *authorized departments of appropriate ministries and agencies*
- *professional scientific associations.*

Who must perform inquiry when claim on research misconduct is made:

- *scientists*
- *mass-media, journalists*
- *investigating authority, office of prosecutor*
- *professional scientific associations*
- *administrative body of the university or research institute*
- *authorized departments of appropriate ministries and agencies*
- *ethical committee of the university or research institute*
- *scientific council of the university or research institute.*

- *Who must perform inquiry when claim on plagiarism is made?*

- *Which sanctions should be imposed in case of research misconduct?*

- *What is the goal of inquiry on research misconduct?*

- *To whom the Code must be addressed?*

Actually in some of these questions respondents are asked to make choice between involvement in different activities related with research misconduct of scientists or, generally speaking, research communities, on one side, and of some external bodies, on the other side.

- Researchers are responsible to different stakeholders, often with somehow divergent interests.
- There are first order responsibilities of a researcher (to scientific community and to sponsor) and second order responsibilities (to the state, if a research project is supported not by the state agencies, and to society or to different social groups within it).
- Strictly speaking, only scientific community is **institutionally (**i.e. not just pragmatically) interested in research integrity.