

PUBLICATION ETHICS

SCIENTIFIC INTEGRITY AND RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

PROF. JAMAL S. AL-JARALLAH

Professor and Consultant

Department of Family and Community Medicine
Chairman ,Clinical Ethic Committee College of
Medicine &KSUMC, KSU


1437

OBJECTIVES

- IMPROVE UNDERSTANDING OF SCIENTIFIC INTEGRITY
- DEFINE RESEARCH MISCONDUCT AND ITS TYPES
- RECOGNIZE GOOD PRACTICE IN AUTHORSHIP AND THE RELATED PROBLEMS
- RECOGNIZE THE PROBLEM OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN RESEARCH



- MOST OF NOT ALL RESEARCHERS DO RESEARCH AND AIM AT PUBLICATION
- THERE IS AN ETHICAL OBLIGATION TO PUBLISH
- OSERVE AND MAINTAIN SCIENTIFIC INEGRITY



SCIENTIFIC INTEGRITY

Adherence to professional values and practices, when conducting and applying the results of science and scholarship.

الالتزام بالقيم والمعايير الأخلاقية والممارسات العلمية عند إجراء البحوث ونشرها وتطبيق نتائجها

Active adherence to the ethical principles and professional standards essential for the responsible practice of research.



THESE INCLUDE:

- Honesty and fairness in proposing, performing, and reporting research
- Accuracy and fairness in representing contributions to research proposals and reports
- Proficiency and fairness in peer review
- Collegiality in scientific interactions, communications and sharing of resources;



- Disclosure of conflicts of interest
- Protection of human subjects in the conduct of research
- Humane care of animals in the conduct of research
- Adherence to the mutual responsibilities of mentors and trainees."





Contact Us



- Home
- About ORI
- News & Events
- Research Misconduct
- RCR Resources
- Programs
- Policies & Regulations
- Assurance Program

5 Ways Supervisors Can Promote Research Integrity

Download ORI's new infographic on promoting integrity.

[Learn more...](#)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

5 WAYS SUPERVISORS CAN PROMOTE RESEARCH INTEGRITY




Misconduct Case Summaries



Newsletter



Follow Us on Twitter



PHS Administrative Action Bulletin Board



Annual Report System

ORI Updates

[Read More](#)

[Subscribe](#)

Jul

Research Misconduct Finding: Zhiyu Li

Social Media



Twitter

ORI Blog

Tweets by @HHS_ORI

SCIENTIFIC INTEGRITY



Objectivity

Clarity

Reproducibility

Utility

RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

Definition of Scientific Misconduct

Scientific misconduct is fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results.

(Federal Register, October, 1999)



MISCONDUCT

FBRICATION is making up data or results and recording or reporting them.

FALSIFICATION is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.

PLAGIARISM is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.

THE EXPANDED DEFINITION

ANY **DIVIATION** FORM OR **VIOLATION** OF
PRINCIPLES OF SCIENTIF INTEGRITY ,
INTENTIONALLY OR AS A RESULT OF
NEGILGENCE DURING DESGN,EXCUTION
AND PUBLICATION OF SCIENTIFIC
RESEARCH

سوء السلوك في مجال البحث العلمي

أي انحراف او خرق لمبادئ النزاهة العلمية بقصد ،وتعمد ،أو إهمال
عند اعداد البحث او تنفيذه او نشره ,ويشمل ذلك التزييف والفبركة
والانتحال ، وغيرها



HOW BIG IS THE PROBLEM?





They concluded that Hauser had fabricated data in one study, manipulated results in multiple experiments, and incorrectly described how studies were conducted.

EDUCATION

Harvard Finds Scientist Guilty of Misconduct

By NICHOLAS WADE AUG. 20, 2010

✉ Email

f Share

🐦 Tweet

📁 Save

➦ More

[Harvard University](#) said Friday that it had found a prominent researcher, Marc Hauser, “solely responsible” for eight instances of scientific misconduct.

Hours later, Dr. Hauser, a rising star for his explorations into cognition and morality, made his first public statement since news of the inquiry emerged last week, telling *The New York Times*, “I acknowledge that I made some significant mistakes” and saying he was “deeply sorry for the problems this case had caused to my students, my colleagues and my university.”

Dr. Hauser is a leader in the field of animal and human cognition, and in 2006 wrote a well-received book, “Moral Minds: How Nature Designed Our Universal Sense of Right and Wrong.” Harvard’s findings against him, if sustained, may cast a shadow over the broad field of scientific research that depended on the particular research technique often used in his experiments.

Harvard itself had faced growing criticism for not releasing more details of



AIP | Journal of Renewable and Sustainable Energy

Peer Reviewed Research
READ NOW >>


FROM OUR ADVERTISERS



NEST

Modern Homes Burn Faster

Find out if your family is prepared for the worst.



DELTA

Built to Last

Sign In | Register now

boston.com

Local Search Site Search

GO

T-Mobile

4 LINES

UP TO

6 GB 4G LTE EACH

\$120/mo.

SWITCH YOUR BUSINESS



Limited time offer; plus taxes/fees. Capable device req'd; coverage not avail. in some areas

HOME TODAY'S GLOBE **NEWS** YOUR TOWN BUSINESS SPORTS LIFESTYLE A&E THINGS TO DO TRAVEL CARS JOBS REAL ESTATE

Local National World Politics Business **Education** Health Science Green Obituaries Special reports Traffic Weather Lottery

HOME / NEWS / EDUCATION

The Boston Globe

Follow Boston.com on Facebook

أعجب 291,949 شخصًا بهذا.

Misconduct case taints research

Colleagues fear questions surrounding Harvard scientist will hurt their work



Some Marc Hauser work was retracted.

By Carolyn Y. Johnson

Globe Staff / September 20, 2010

E-mail | Print | Reprints

Text size - +

ADVERTISEMENT

MOST E-MAILED »»

1. Report: Warrant Issued for Roggie's Bar Owner
2. Map of Greater Boston Farmers Markets
3. Boston Pops Concert Move Keeps the Beach Boys, Ditches Joey McIntyre
4. We Tried Out Those New Solar Benches
5. New England's top outdoor water parks
6. Drink of the Week: Mojito Italiano
7. Lawmakers pass compounding pharmacy oversight bill

FOLLOW THIS LIST ON TWITTER: @BOSTONPOPULAR ▶

Search

go

[Advanced search](#)

Access

To read this story in full you will need to login or make a payment (see right).

[nature.com](#) > [Journal home](#) > [Table of Contents](#)

Commentary

Nature **435**, 737-738 (9 June 2005) | doi:10.1038/435737a; Published online 8 June 2005

Scientists behaving badly

Brian C. Martinson¹, Melissa S. Anderson² & Raymond de Vries³

1. Brian C. Martinson is at the HealthPartners Research Foundation, 8100 34th Avenue South, PO Box 1524, Mailstop 21111R, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55440-1524, USA.

2. Melissa S. Anderson is at the University of Minnesota, Educational Policy and Administration, 330 Wulling Hall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455, USA.

3. Raymond de Vries is at the University of Minnesota, Center for Bioethics, N504 Boynton, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455, USA.

To protect the integrity of science, we must look beyond falsification, fabrication and plagiarism, to a wider range of questionable research practices, argue Brian C. Martinson, Melissa S. Anderson and Raymond de Vries.

▲ Top

Serious misbehaviour in research is important for many reasons, not least because it damages the reputation of, and undermines public support for, science. Historically, professionals and the public have focused on headline-grabbing cases of scientific misconduct, but we believe that researchers can no longer afford to ignore a wider range of questionable behaviour that threatens the integrity of science.






ARTICLE LINKS

▶ [Figures and tables](#)

SEE ALSO

▶ [Editor's Summary](#)

ARTICLE TOOLS

-  [Send to a friend](#)
-  [Export citation](#)
-  [Export references](#)
-  [Rights and permissions](#)
-  [Order commercial reprints](#)

SEARCH PUBMED FOR

- ▶ [Brian C. Martinson](#)
- ▶ [Melissa S. Anderson](#)
- ▶ [Raymond de Vries](#)

I want to purchase this article

Price: \$18

In order to purchase this article you must be a registered user.

[Register now](#)

I want to buy this article via ReadCube

Rent: \$3.99*

Purchase: \$9.99*

*Printing and sharing restrictions apply

[Purchase now](#)

I want to subscribe to *Nature*

Price: US\$199

This includes a free subscription to *Nature News* together with *Nature Journal*.

[Subscribe now](#)

Table 1 | Percentage of scientists who say that they engaged in the behaviour listed within the previous three years (n = 3,247)

Top ten behaviours	All	Mid-career	Early-career
1. Falsifying or 'cooking' research data	0.3	0.2	0.5
2. Ignoring major aspects of human-subject requirements	0.3	0.3	0.4
3. Not properly disclosing involvement in firms whose products are based on one's own research	0.3	0.4	0.3
4. Relationships with students, research subjects or clients that may be interpreted as questionable	1.4	1.3	1.4
5. Using another's ideas without obtaining permission or giving due credit	1.4	1.7	1.0
6. Unauthorized use of confidential information in connection with one's own research	1.7	2.4	0.8 ***
7. Failing to present data that contradict one's own previous research	6.0	6.5	5.3
8. Circumventing certain minor aspects of human-subject requirements	7.6	9.0	6.0 **
9. Overlooking others' use of flawed data or questionable interpretation of data	12.5	12.2	12.8
10. Changing the design, methodology or results of a study in response to pressure from a funding source	15.5	20.6	9.5 ***
Other behaviours			
11. Publishing the same data or results in two or more publications	4.7	5.9	3.4 **
12. Inappropriately assigning authorship credit	10.0	12.3	7.4 ***
13. Withholding details of methodology or results in papers or proposals	10.8	12.4	8.9 **
14. Using inadequate or inappropriate research designs	13.5	14.6	12.2
15. Dropping observations or data points from analyses based on a gut feeling that they were inaccurate	15.3	14.3	16.5
16. Inadequate record keeping related to research projects	27.5	27.7	27.3


Note: significance of χ^2 tests of differences between mid- and early-career scientists are noted by ** ($P < 0.01$) and *** ($P < 0.001$).

أنواع سوء السلوك


- تلفيق البيانات واختلاقها (Fabrication)
- تزيف البيانات والنتائج (Falsification. .)
- الانتحال والسرقة الفكرية (Plagiarism)
- قضايا التأليف والنشر

Aurhorship and Publication

تلفيق البيانات واختلاقها (Fabrication)



تزيف البيانات والنتائج (Falsification. .)



"Raphael B. Stricker, M.D., University of California at San Francisco. An investigation conducted by the University found that Dr. Stricker falsified data for a manuscript and a PHS-supported publication reporting research on AIDS.

In the manuscript, Dr. Stricker selectively suppressed data that did not support his hypothesis, and reported consistently positive data where only one of four experiments had produced positive results. In the publication, Dr. Stricker reported that an antibody was found in 20 homosexuals, but not found in non-homosexuals.



However, Dr. Stricker's control data, which he suppressed, showed antibody in 33 of 65 non-homosexuals. The falsified data was used as the basis for a grant application to the National Institutes of Health. The ORI concurred in the University's finding. Dr. Stricker executed a Voluntary Exclusion and Settlement Agreement in which he has agreed not to apply for Federal grant or contract funds and will not serve on PHS advisory committees, boards or peer review groups for a three year period beginning April 1, 1993."

Also reported in the same notice:

"Tian-Shing Lee, M.D., Joslin Diabetes Center, Harvard Medical School. An investigation conducted by Harvard found that Dr. Lee, a former post-doctoral fellow at the Joslin Diabetes Center, fabricated and falsified data in research on diabetes supported by the National Eye Institute. Primary data was missing for almost half of the figures and tables in a series of published papers and manuscripts prepared by Dr. Lee. Many instances of data fabrication and falsification were found, including presenting data for cell counts that were never performed,

Blood pressure research by scientist Anna Ahimastos retracted over faked data

By Nicky Phillips


Updated September 17, 2015 – 5.23pm, first published at 12.30pm



TODAY'S TOP STORIES

LABOR IN TURMOIL


Lawyer 'categorically' denies advising Labor boss to cover up \$100,000 donation



VALE

AFL legend Danny Frawley killed in car crash

53 minutes ago



COURTS

Man accused of murdering




The research of a promising Australian scientist has been retracted after an investigation found she faked results in the trial of a blood pressure drug.

Dr Anna Ahimastos was a researcher at the Baker IDI Heart and Diabetes Institute in Melbourne when she fabricated data that was published in two international journals.

On Tuesday, the *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)* [retracted](#) Dr Ahimastos' paper on a three-year clinical trial of a blood pressure drug, Ramipril. The study found the drug, a safe and effective treatment for lowering blood pressure, also helped patients with artery disease walk for longer and with less pain.

While the study has been retracted, Baker IDI said participants involved in the trial were not exposed to any danger. Subsequent studies also suggest the original finding may still be correct.

In June, another Baker IDI researcher noticed inconsistencies in the original study data, which promoted an internal investigation.



PLAGIARISM



The use of others' published and unpublished **ideas or words** (or other **intellectual property**) without attribution or permission, and presenting them as new and original rather than derived from an existing source.

PLAGIARISM

“**Theft or misappropriation** of intellectual property and the substantial unattributed textual copying of another’s work.”


Office of Research Integrity (ORI) of the United States

PLAGIARISM

IDEAS

TEXTS

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY



SELFPL-AGIARISM

Self-Plagiarism is defined as a type of plagiarism in which the writer republishes a work in its entirety or reuses portions of a previously written text while authoring a new work

<http://www.ithenticate.com/plagiarism-detection-blog/bid/65061/What-Is-Self-Plagiarism-and-How-to-Avoid-It#.V5nKq7h97IU>



DUPLICATE PUBLICATION

REDUNDANT PUBLICATION

understanding what duplicate, copied content is and how you can help stop the thieves stealing the content you have worked hard to produce.

The hub is broken into three sections; a short discussion on using copied material yourself, instructions on how to find your content that has been copied by someone else and a final section on how to get that stolen material removed from the web. I will apologize in advance if the next section seems a little less than - I've had a considerable amount of my work stolen by content thieves - but many people don't understand the ramifications of copying web content and what it means to do so.

Copying Content for Your Own Use

The Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) is a US law that protects the copyright of digital mediums; for the purpose of this hub, your work published on the internet. It is coordinated with the European Union and is accepted throughout most, but not all, of the world.

Simplifying considerably, it says that your work on the internet is automatically protected by copyright law, but without specific permission no one else can reproduce and republish it. It also clearly protects the work of others; you cannot legally copy their work and use it in your hub. Additional information can be found on Wikipedia as well as other locations.

Usable Web Content

Certain material is considered to be in the public domain. Images over 100 years old, Government funded documents or images (at least in the US; other countries may and do differ). Public domain material can be used by anyone for any purpose.

Some authors voluntarily release their work, usually photos, into the public domain where it is freely available. Others permit the use of their material only if attributed to them, if it is unmodified or if it is not used for commercial purposes. Make sure that you understand the permissible uses for content before using it, and realize and respect the fact that if you can't find permission it means you are not free to use it.



Pirillo
& Fitz

Whaddya mean all my facts are wrong?!?

I copied everything straight off the internet!!

SOLUTIONS

- BE HONEST
- USE YOUR OWN WORDS
- ACKNOWLEDGE PEOPLE
- CITE YOUR QUTES PROPERLY



DON'T COPY

STOP
Plagiarism

PLAGIARISM CHECKERS

Top 20 Best Plagiarism Checker Tools in 2019: Free & Paid

Here is the list of top 20 best plagiarism checker tools for 2019:

S.No	Best Plagiarism Checker (Name & Details)	More Details
1	Grammarly Plagiarism Checker	Try it Now »
2	WhiteSmoke Plagiarism Checker	Try it Now »
3	ProWritingAid	Try it Now »
4	Duplichecker	Try it Now »
5	PlagiarismCheck.Org	Try it Now »
6	Quetext	Try it Now »
7	SmallSEOTools Plagiarism Checker	Try it Now »
8	Copleaks	Try it Now »
9	Viper	Try it Now »

Boost Your Rankings In a Shot!

Best Plagiarism Checkers To Detect Duplicate Content

Latest Reviews: [Divi Theme Review](#) | [Flywheel Hosting Review](#) | [Best WordPress Blog Themes](#) | [GetResponse Review](#)

Exciting Coupons: [InMotion Hosting Discount](#) | [SEMrush 14 Day Free Trial Promo Code](#) | [Grammarly Discount Coupon](#)

Plagiarism Detection

Check your writing for plagiarism and correct grammar.



Try Now



Check Your Content Plagiarism Now!

AUTHORSHIP



Each author should take responsibility for a specific part of the world

WHO QUALIFY TO BE AN AUTHOR?


WHO QUALIFY TO BE AN AUTHOR?

- The ICMJE recommends that authorship be based on the following 4 criteria:
- **Substantial contributions** to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
- Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
- Final approval of the version to be published; AND
- **Agreement to be accountable** for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.
- In addition to being accountable for the parts of the work he or she has done, an author should be able to identify which co-authors are responsible for specific other parts of the work. In addition, authors should have confidence in the integrity of the contributions of their co-authors.

الضابط في أحقية التأليف

- أن يشارك الباحث مشاركة فعالة في البحث وان تكون له مساهمة فكرية علمية جوهرية وذلك في مراحل البحث أو بعضها مثل : تصميم الدراسة البحثية والحصول على البيانات وتحليلها وتفسيرها
- كتابة مسوده الورقه العلمية الأولى او مراجعتها النقديه من حيث محتواها الفكري والعلمي
- الموافقه النهائيه على النسخه التي يراد نشرها
- الموافقة على أن يكون مسؤولاً مسؤوليه كامله عن محتوى الورقة العلمية ودقة المعلومات المدونه فيها وعدم وجود اي امر يخل بالنزاهة العلمية

PROBLEMS WITH AUTHORSHIP



“No, it’s my wife’s turn to be the first author
on **your** paper.”

- GIFT /GUEST AUTHORSHIP



- GHOST AUTHORSHIP

 - *Included in the list of authors without permission

 - *An individual makes a substantial contribution to the research or the writing of the report, but is not listed as an author (WRITERS FOR DRUG COMPANIES)



- PRESSURED AUTHORSHIP

 - Authoritative(Head of department...etc)



- HONORARY AUTHORSHIP

 - Well-known figures in the field



ANALYSIS OF 630 MANUSCRIPT

AUTHORSHIP	PREVALENCE
HONORARY	17.6%
GHOST	8%

WISLAR,et al .BMJ. 2011; 343: d6128.

Published online 2011 Oct 25. doi: [10.1136/bmj.d6128](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.d6128)

RETRACTION OF MANUSCRIPTS

EARLY REPORT

Early report

Ileal-lymphoid-nodular hyperplasia, non-specific colitis, and pervasive developmental disorder in children

A J Wakefield, S H Murch, A Anthony, J Linnell, D M Casson, M Malik, M Berelowitz, A P Dhillon, M A Thomson, P Harvey, A Valentine, S E Davies, J A Walker-Smith

Summary

Background We investigated a consecutive series of children with chronic enterocolitis and regressive developmental disorder.

Methods 12 children (mean age 6 years [range 3–10], 11 boys) were referred to a paediatric gastroenterology unit with a history of normal development followed by loss of acquired skills, including language, together with diarrhoea and abdominal pain. Children underwent gastroenterological, neurological, and developmental assessment and review of developmental records. Ileocolonoscopy and biopsy sampling, magnetic-resonance imaging (MRI), electroencephalography (EEG), and lumbar puncture were done under sedation. Barium follow-through radiography was done where possible. Biochemical, haematological, and immunological profiles were examined.

Findings Onset of behavioural symptoms was associated by the parents, with measles, mumps, and rubella vaccination in eight of the 12 children, with measles infection in one child, and otitis media in another. All 12 children had intestinal abnormalities, ranging from lymphoid nodular hyperplasia to granuloid ulceration. Histology showed patchy chronic inflammation in 11 children and reactive ileal lymphoid hyperplasia in seven, but no granulomas. Behavioural disorders included autism (nine), disintegrative psychosis (one), and possible postviral or vaccinal encephalitis (two). There were no focal neurological abnormalities and MRI and EEG tests were normal. Abnormal laboratory results were significantly raised urinary methylmalonic acid compared with age-matched controls ($p=0.03$), low haemoglobin in four children, and low serum IgA in two children.

Interpretation We identify associated gastrointestinal disease and developmental regression in a group of previously normal children, which was generally associated in time with possible environmental triggers.

Lancet 1998; **351**: 637–41
See Commentary page

Inflammatory Bowel Disease Study Group, University Departments of Medicine and Histopathology (A J Wakefield *FRCS*, A Anthony *MB*, J Linnell *FRCD*, A P Dhillon *MChD*, S E Davies *MChD*), and the University Departments of Paediatric Gastroenterology (S H Murch *MB*, D M Casson *MChD*, M Malik *MChD*, M A Thomson *FRCP*, J A Walker-Smith *FRCP*), Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (M Berelowitz *FRCPsych*), Neurology (P Harvey *FRCP*), and Radiology (A Valentine *FRCD*), Royal Free Hospital and School of Medicine, London NW3 2QG, UK

Correspondence to: Dr A J Wakefield

Introduction

We saw several children who, after a period of apparent normality, lost acquired skills, including communication. They all had gastrointestinal symptoms, including abdominal pain, diarrhoea, and bloating and, in some cases, food intolerance. We describe the clinical findings, and gastrointestinal features, of these children.

Patients and methods

12 children, consecutively referred to the department of paediatric gastroenterology with a history of a pervasive developmental disorder with loss of acquired skills and intestinal symptoms (abdominal pain, bloating and food intolerance), were investigated. All children were admitted to the ward for one week, accompanied by their parents.

Clinical investigations

We took histories, including details of immunisations and exposure to infectious diseases, and assessed the children. In 11 cases the history was obtained by the senior clinician (JW-S). Neurological and psychiatric assessments were done by consultant staff (PH, MB) with HMS-4 criteria.¹ Developmental records included a review of prospective developmental records from parents, health visitors, and general practitioners. Four children did not undergo psychiatric assessment in hospital; all had been assessed professionally elsewhere, so these assessments were used as the basis for their behavioural diagnosis.

After bowel preparation, ileocolonoscopy was performed by SHM or MAT under sedation with midazolam and pethidine. Paired frozen and formalin-fixed mucosal biopsy samples were taken from the terminal ileum; ascending, transverse, descending, and sigmoid colons, and from the rectum. The procedure was recorded by video or still images, and were compared with images of the previous seven consecutive paediatric colonoscopies (four normal colonoscopies and three on children with ulcerative colitis), in which the physician reported normal appearances in the terminal ileum. Barium follow-through radiography was possible in some cases.


Also under sedation, cerebral magnetic-resonance imaging (MRI), electroencephalography (EEG) including visual, brain stem auditory, and sensory evoked potentials (where compliance made these possible), and lumbar puncture were done.

Laboratory investigations

Thyroid function, serum long-chain fatty acids, and cerebrospinal-fluid lactate were measured to exclude known causes of childhood neurodegenerative disease. Urinary methylmalonic acid was measured in random urine samples from eight of the 12 children and 14 age-matched and sex-matched normal controls, by a modification of a technique described previously.² Chromatograms were scanned digitally on computer, to analyse the methylmalonic-acid zones from cases and controls. Urinary methylmalonic-acid concentrations in patients and controls were compared by a two-sample *t* test. Urinary creatinine was estimated by routine spectrophotometric assay.

Children were screened for antiendomysial antibodies and boys were screened for fragile-X if this had not been done

Figure 1. Papers published and retracted per year since 1973.



Steen RG, Casadevall A, Fang FC (2013) Why Has the Number of Scientific Retractions Increased?. PLoS ONE 8(7): e68397.
doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0068397
<http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=info:doi/10.1371/journal.pone.0068397>

TABLE 2
Reason for Retraction
(Total Number of Retractions = 1,112.)

Reason	Number (%)
Misconduct, admitted	486 (44%)
Misconduct, presumed	152 (14%)
Could not replicate results	127 (11%)
Error: problems with data	113 (10%)
Error: problems with method, analysis, interpretation	76 (7%)
Error: problems with sample	31 (3%)
Accidental duplication, publisher	26 (2%)
Accidental duplication, author	10 (less than 1%)
Other	19 (2%)
No reason given	72 (6%)

Author Responsibilities

– Preparation and Submission of Manuscripts:

Follow General Rules:

- Ensure work is new and original research
- All Authors are aware of submission and agree with content and support submission
- Agree that the manuscript can be examined by anonymous reviewers.
- Provide copies of related work submitted or published elsewhere
- Obtain copyright permission if figures/tables need to be reproduced
- Include proper affiliation

CONFLICT OF INTEREST






"You are completely free to carry out whatever research you want, so long as you come to these conclusions."

الأمانة

- الأصالة والإبداع
- مراجعة البحوث السابقة بشكل جيد
- عدم التعدي على حقوق الآخرين
- عدم تعريض الناس للأخطار أو خديعتهم و غشهم
- الكفاءة العلمية



شيء لم يسبق إليه يخترعه
شيء ناقص يتمه
شيء مستغلق يشرحه
شيء طويل يختصره
شيء مختلط يرتبه
شيء أخطأ فيه مصنعه يبينه
شيء مفرق يجمعه

الأمانة

- إتباع الطرق العلمية بدقة ومصداقية
- عدم تزوير طرق البحث أو نتائجه أو إدعاء الحصول على نتائج لم يتوصل إليها فعلا
- التجرد وعدم التحيز
- إختيار فريق البحث الملائم
- البعد عن الاستغلال

الأمانة

- أن لا يتعارض البحث مع الأحكام والقيم والأخلاقيات الإسلامية
- البعد عن الأبحاث التي أضرارها أكثر من منافعها
- عرض النتائج بمصداقية وشفافية
- البعد عن إختلاق النتائج أو تزيفها
- عدم حجب النتائج
- عدم إدعاء ما لم يتوصل إليه من النتائج

الضوابط الأخلاقية

• الامانه في النقل :

• يقول الامام النووي رحمه الله (.... ومن النصيحة ان تضاف الفائدة التي تستغرب الى قائلها . فمن فعل ذلك بورك في عمله وحاله ومن أوهم فيما يأخذه من كلام غيره انه له فهو جدير ان لا ينتفع بعلمه , ولا يبارك له في حال , ولم يزل اهل العلم والفضل على اضافة الفوائد الى قائلها

• عدم الانتحال وادعاء ملكية ما لا يملك:

يقول النبي صل الله عليه وسلم "المتشبع بما لم يعط كلابس ثوبي زور" (

ويعلق الامام ابن القيم على هذا الحديث فيقول : (التشبع افتخار الانسان بما لا يملكه)

- الأمانة في عرض المادة العلمية
- التجرد وعدم اتباع الهوى وعدم التحيز
- تجنب الغش والخداع

SOLUTIONS

- EDUCATION , AWARENESS AND TRAINING
- PROMOTION OF SCIENTIFIC INTEGRITY
- PROMOTION OF ETHICAL CONDUCT
- CODES AND REGULATIONS
- DEALING WITH MISCONDUCT ALLEGATIONS
- EASINESS OF REPORTING AND PROTECTION OF WHISTELBLOWERS
- DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST



THANK YOU