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Document 1
Findings of research misconduct.
NIH guide for grants and contracts (Online) 2012 Jan 6: NOT-OD-12-029
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 2
Findings of research misconduct.
NIH guide for grants and contracts (Online) 2012 Jan 6: NOT-OD-12-030
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 3
Findings of research misconduct.
NIH guide for grants and contracts (Online) 2012 Jan 6: NOT-OD-12-028
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 4
Hewitt, Martin
BMJ is in danger of losing sight of the patient.
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2011 December 6; 343: d7887
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 5
Pharoah, Paul D
Money is the greatest conflict of all.
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2011 December 6; 343: d7888
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 6
Green, Malcolm
MMR is but the tip of the iceberg.
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2011 December 6; 343: d7889; author reply 7890

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 7
Merritt, Maria W.
"Health researchers" ancillary care obligations in low-resource settings: how can we tell what is morally required?
Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal 2011 December; 21(4): 311-347

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 8
De Caterina, Raffaele; Griffioen, Arjan W; Porreca, Frank
Fraud in biomedical research—the role of journal editors.
Life sciences 2011 Nov 21; 89(21-22): 755-6

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 9
Findings of research misconduct.
NIH guide for grants and contracts (Online) 2011 Nov 11: NOT-OD-12-010

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

---

Document 10
Wise, Jacqui
Extent of Dutch psychologist's research fraud was "unprecedented".
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2011 November 7; 343: d7201

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 11
Findings of research misconduct.
NIH guide for grants and contracts (Online) 2011 Oct 27: NOT-OD-12-009

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 12
Uncharted territory.
Nature 2011 October 19; 478(7369): 285

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
Document 13
Chrétien, Michel
Mechanisms required to ensure research integrity.
CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne 2011 Oct 18; 183(15): 1751
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 14
Dyer, Clare
Liverpool University suspends professor for alleged research misconduct.
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2011 October 17; 343: d6712
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 15
Findings of research misconduct.
NIH guide for grants and contracts (Online) 2011 Oct 14: NOT-OD-12-007
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 16
Findings of research misconduct.
NIH guide for grants and contracts (Online) 2011 Oct 14: NOT-OD-12-006
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 17
Findings of research misconduct.
NIH guide for grants and contracts (Online) 2011 Oct 7: NOT-OD-12-002
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 18
Hart, Anna
The scandal of unpublished research.
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 19
Furuse, Akira
[Organization of academic papers (3)].
Document 20
Nilsson, Peter M; Olsson, Peter
[Statement of conflict of interest in research. A bias database—simple and open for all!]. = Redovisning av intressekonflikter i forskning. Databas för jäv–enkel och öppen för alla!
Läkartidningen 2011 Oct 19-25; 108(42): 2073

Document 21
Blackened names.
Nature 2011 September 28; 477(7366): 509-10

Document 22
Zarb, Alfred P
Misconduct: make integrity key to recruitment.
Nature 2011 September 21; 477(7365): 407

Document 23
Abbott, Alison
Austria reinstates disgraced doctor.
Nature 2011 September 20; 477(7365): 384

Document 24
Blow, Nathan
The conflicting meaning of transparency.
BioTechniques 2011 Sep; 51(3): 147

Document 25
Birkhahn, Robert H; Fromm, Christian; Larabee, Todd; Diercks, Deborah B
Self-reported financial conflicts of interest during scientific presentations in emergency medicine.
Academic emergency medicine : official journal of the Society for Academic Emergency Medicine 2011 Sep; 18(9): 977-80
Abstract: This study was a review of the scientific abstracts presented at a national conference for the required conflict of interest (COI) disclosure both before the meeting and during presentation.
Document 26
Brody, Howard; Buchanan, David; Miller, Franklin G

Misunderstanding, period.

Document 27
Mazoit, Jean Xavier

Plagiarism and proper English writing: the dilemma.
Anesthesia and analgésia 2011 Sep; 113(3): 664; author reply 664

Document 28

Keep it clean.
Nature 2011 August 17; 476(7360): 251

Document 29
Siva, Nayanah

Nature group journal retracts two papers after cancer researcher was found to have falsified data.
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2011 August 15; 343: d5218

Document 30

Findings of research misconduct.
NIH guide for grants and contracts (Online) 2011 Aug 12: NOT-OD-11-103

Document 31
Kongsgaard, Ulf E; Ræder, Johan

[Scientific misconduct with colloid plasma substitutes]. = Forskningsjuks med kolloide plasmaerstattere.

Document 32
Reich, Eugenie Samuel
Bear researcher frozen out.
Nature 2011 August 2; 476(7358): 16-7

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 33
Edwards, I Ralph

Conflicts of interest in medicines safety and regulation: how much conflict and how much interest should we allow?
Drug safety : an international journal of medical toxicology and drug experience 2011 Aug 1; 34(8): 617-21

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

---

Document 34
Wadman, Meredith

Conflict disclosure plan dropped.
Nature 2011 August 1; 476(7358): 17

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

---

Document 35
Carragee, Eugene J; Hurwitz, Eric L; Weiner, Bradley K; Bono, Christopher M; Rothman, David J

Future directions for The spine journal: managing and reporting conflict of interest issues.

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

---

Document 36
Oner, F Cumhur; Dhert, Wouter J A

Challenging the medico-industrial-administrative complex.

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 37
Fernández Mondéjar, E; Ceraso, Hugo

[A flagrant case of scientific fraud]. = Un estrepitoso caso de fraude científico.
Medicina intensiva / Sociedad Española de Medicina Intensiva y Unidades Coronarias 2011 Aug-Sep; 35(6): 323-7

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 38
Steen, R Grant

Misinformation in the medical literature: what role do error and fraud play?

Abstract: Media attention to retracted research suggests that a substantial number of papers are corrupted by
misinformation. In reality, every paper contains misinformation; at issue is whether the balance of correct versus incorrect information is acceptable. This paper postulates that analysis of retracted research papers can provide insight into medical misinformation, although retracted papers are not a random sample of incorrect papers. Error is the most common reason for retraction and error may be the principal cause of misinformation as well. Still, one-quarter of retracted papers are fraudulent, and misinformation may also arise through fraud. This paper hypothesises that error and fraud are the main sources of misinformation and that error is more common than fraud. Retraction removes misinformation from the literature; bias is non-retracted misinformation. Bias arises when scientific impropriety results in false research findings. Impropriety can involve experimental design, data collection, data analysis, or data presentation. Yet impropriety also arises through earnest error or statistical naiveté; not all bias is fraud. Several measures are proposed to minimise misinformation in the medical literature, including: greater detail in the clinical trial registry, with rigorous definition of inclusion and exclusion criteria and primary endpoints; clear statistical criteria for every aspect of clinical trials, especially sample size; responsibility for data integrity that accrues to all named authors; increased transparency as to how the costs of research were paid; and greater clarity as to the reasons for retraction. Misinformation can arise without malicious intent; authors of incorrect papers are owed a presumption of incompetence, not malice.

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text
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**Document 39**

Breithaupt, Holger

**Freedom and responsibility.**

EMBO reports 2011 July 29; 12(8): 744

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

---

**Document 40**

Steneck, Nicholas H

**The dilemma of the honest researcher.**

EMBO reports 2011 July 29; 12(8): 745

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

---

**Document 41**

Beisiegel, Ulrike

**Discussing honesty, diligence and education. An interview with Ulrike Beisiegel, President of Göttingen University and former chairperson of the ombudsman for science in Germany. Interview by Holger Breithaupt.**

EMBO reports 2011 July 15; 12(8): 754-7

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text
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**Document 42**

Martinson, Brian C

**The academic birth rate. Production and reproduction of the research work force, and its effect on innovation and research misconduct.**

EMBO reports 2011 July 8; 12(8): 758-62

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text
Document 43
Shah, Naseem
Ethical issues in biomedical research and publication.
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 44
Soldin, Offie P; Brent, Gregory A; Kloos, Richard T
Publication of industry-sponsored medical research: guidelines from the Consortium of Laboratory Medicine Journal Editors.
Thyroid: official journal of the American Thyroid Association 2011 Jul; 21(7): 693
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 45
McCalmont, Timothy H
Crystal clear.
Journal of cutaneous pathology 2011 Jul; 38(7): 540-1
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 46
Samuel Reich, Eugenie
Biologist spared jail for grant fraud.
Nature 2011 June 28; 474(7353): 552
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 47
Myburgh, John A
Fraud in fluid resuscitation research.
The Medical journal of Australia 2011 Jun 20; 194(12): 621-2
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 48
Findings of misconduct in science/research misconduct.
NIH guide for grants and contracts (Online) 2011 Jun 17: NOT-OD-11-084
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-11-044.html (link may be outdated)
Document 49
Vaccaro, Alexander R; Patel, Alpesh A; Fisher, Charles
Author conflict and bias in research: quantifying the downgrade in methodology.
Spine 2011 Jun 15; 36(14): E895-6
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder] for access to full text

Document 50
Reich, Eugenie Samuel
Whistle-blower claims his accusations cost him his job.
Nature 2011 June 8; 474(7350): 140-1
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder] for access to full text

Document 51
Nosengo, Nicola
Scientists on trial over L'Aquila deaths.
Nature 2011 Jun 2; 474(7349): 15
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder] for access to full text

Document 52
Wang, Chih-Chen; Wang, Zhi-Xin; Zhang, Baoyuan; Li, Ming
Dr. Chen-Iu Tsou: a tireless advocate for advancement in the standards of scientific research in China.
Protein & cell 2011 Jun; 2(6): 435-6
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder] for access to full text

Document 53
Lanzafame, Raymond J
Leave your sidearms not your ethics at the door.
Photomedicine and laser surgery 2011 Jun; 29(6): 363-4
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder] for access to full text

Document 54
Louv, Quinette; Grimmer-Somers, Karen; Bialocerkowski, Andrea
Research integrity and misconduct: first-hand experiences of plagiarism and data manufacture.
Physiotherapy research international : the journal for researchers and clinicians in physical therapy 2011 Jun; 16(2): 63-8
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder] for access to full text

Document 55
Myburgh, John
**CHEST and the impact of fraud in fluid resuscitation research.**
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

---

Man, Li-Xing; Beswick, Daniel M; Johnson, Jonas T; Schaitkin, Barry M
**Postmatch findings in otolaryngology residency applicants with publication misrepresentation.**
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

---
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McCarthy, Mark
**Health research—Europe's future.**
Lancet 2011 May 21; 377(9779): 1744-5
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

---

O'Dowd, Adrian
**Experts deny claims that peer review system is in crisis.**
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2011 May 5; 342: d2858
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

---

Forssén, Annika; Meland, Eivind; Hetlevik, Irene; Strand, Roger
**Rethinking scientific responsibility.**
Journal of medical ethics 2011 May; 37(5): 299-302
**Abstract:** Researchers should be made co-responsible for the wider consequences of their research focus and the application of their findings. This paper describes a meta-reflection procedure that can be used as a tool to enhance scientific responsibility and reflective practice. The point of departure is that scientific practice is situated in power relations, has direction and, consequently, power implications. The contextual preconditions and implications of research should be stated and discussed openly. The reflection method aims at revealing both upstream elements, such as for instance preconceptions, and downstream elements, for example, public consequences of research. The validity of research might improve from such discussions. Validity should preferably be understood as a broader concept than the methodological concerns in science.
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text
**Document 61**

Chabot, Jean-Michel

[Conflict of interest: the impact on readers]. = Conflit d'intérêts: l'impact sur les lecteurs.
La Revue du praticien 2011 May; 61(5): 667-8

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

**Document 62**

They did a bad bad thing.
Nature chemistry 2011 May; 3(5): 337

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

**Document 63**

Findings of research misconduct.
NIH guide for grants and contracts (Online) 2011 Apr 29: NOT-OD-11-070

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

**Document 64**

Findings of research misconduct.
NIH guide for grants and contracts (Online) 2011 Apr 29: NOT-OD-11-071

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

**Document 65**

Rode, Sigmar de Mello

Plagiarism in scientific publication.
Brazilian oral research 2011 Apr; 25(2): 101

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

**Document 66**

Sharma, Bharat Bhushan; Singh, Virendra

Ethics in writing: Learning to stay away from plagiarism and scientific misconduct.
Lung India : official organ of Indian Chest Society 2011 Apr; 28(2): 148-50

**Abstract:** Fraudulent data and plagiarized text may corrupt scientific medical literature and ultimately harm patients. By prescribing erroneous treatment to an individual, only single patient is affected; but by presenting incorrect data or transcripts, the whole scientific medical universe is affected. Although both scenarios are highly undesirable, one can assume the magnitude of the effect of latter. Writers of scientific medical literature have been found to be involved in plagiarism and other publication misconducts from time to time irrespective of social, economic and geographic structure. The reason of such behavior is not usually obvious. Easy availability of personal computers has led to widespread dissemination of medical literature. As a result, young scientists are now publishing their research more frequently and efficiently. At the same time, this has increased the tendency to submit hurriedly prepared, poorly drafted and even illegitimate publications. Use of some amount of copy-paste followed by modifications during preparation of a manuscript seems to be common. Therefore, the researchers, especially
postgraduate students, should be educated continuously about ethical medical writing.

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 67
Miller, Donald R
**Publication fraud: implications to the individual and to the specialty.**
Current opinion in anaesthesiology 2011 Apr; 24(2): 154-9

**Abstract:** To provide a brief review and update on the subject of scientific misconduct relevant to the specialty of anesthesia. The overall goal is to raise awareness amongst readers of the scientific literature that although publication fraud is relatively infrequent, the reasons for fraud are complex and the consequences to the individual and for the specialty are substantial.

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

---

Document 68
Frank, Martin
**We must do better!**
The Physiologist 2011 Apr; 54(2): 43-5

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 69
Thörn, Ake
*[Is the clinical research crisis a measurement error?]. = Ar den kliniska forskningens kris ett mätfel?*
Läkartidningen 2011 Apr 20-May 3; 108(16-17): 904-5

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 70
Svensén, Christer
*[Leading anesthesiologist accused of scientific misconduct. We are not changing our protocols–yet]. = Ledande anestesiolog anklagad för forskningsfusk. Vi ändrar inte våra protokoll–ännu.*
Läkartidningen 2011 Apr 20-May 3; 108(16-17): 905

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 71
Latefi, Nazlie
**Pooled trials drowning in conflict-of-interest oversights.**
Nature medicine 2011 Apr; 17(4): 400-1

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 72
Steen, R Grant
Retractions in the scientific literature: is the incidence of research fraud increasing?

Abstract: Scientific papers are retracted for many reasons including fraud (data fabrication or falsification) or error (plagiarism, scientific mistake, ethical problems). Growing attention to fraud in the lay press suggests that the incidence of fraud is increasing.

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 73
Chalmers, D
Viewpoint: are the research ethics committees working in the best interests of participants in an increasingly globalized research environment?
Journal of internal medicine 2011 Apr; 269(4): 392-5

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 74
Whitney, S N; Schneider, C E
Viewpoint: a method to estimate the cost in lives of ethics board review of biomedical research.
Journal of internal medicine 2011 Apr; 269(4): 396-402

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 75
Holm, S
Commentary: systems, rules and the costs of being ethical—a response to D. Chalmers and to S. Whitney and C. Schneider.
Journal of internal medicine 2011 Apr; 269(4): 403-6

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 76
Weber, Karl T
A treasure trove of talent.
The American journal of the medical sciences 2011 Apr; 341(4): 263-5

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

---

Document 77
Samuel Reich, Eugenie
US government scientists test limits of conflict rules.
Nature 2011 Mar 24; 471(7339): 423

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 78
US free-speech law offers protection--at a price.
Nature 2011 Mar 17; 471(7338): 276-7

Chassang, Gauthier; Rial-Sebbag, Emmanuelle; Cambon-Thomsen, Anne
[The foundation of research ethics in community law]. = Les fondements de l'éthique de la recherche en droit communautaire.
Abstract: The creation of the European Community by the Treaty of Rome in 1957 marked the beginning of the efforts to coordinate and harmonize national policies in many strategic sectors with high economic value, among them several aspects of scientific research. The European Union Law, formerly known as European Community law, now includes a range of ethical principles that apply to research projects developed with the financial support of the European Union. Which were the steps in the integration of the ethics of sciences in the context of the Union? This article aims to study first, what were, and what are the legal bases of the integration of the ethical dimension of researches in life sciences by the European Union and, secondly, the institutional organisation that has been set up in order to discuss the development of common ethical norms, especially bioethics one, and in order to apply these rules which respect national particularities. In this regard, we analyse the relevant legal texts providing a foundation for the creation of a European bio-law and we give an overview of the European institutions' activity in the field of bioethics by looking particularly at the health research field.

Sterckx, Sigrid
Patenting and licensing of university research: promoting innovation or undermining academic values?
Science and engineering ethics 2011 Mar; 17(1): 45-64
Abstract: Since the 1980s in the US and the 1990s in Europe, patenting and licensing activities by universities have massively increased. This is strongly encouraged by governments throughout the Western world. Many regard academic patenting as essential to achieve 'knowledge transfer' from academia to industry. This trend has far-reaching consequences for access to the fruits of academic research and so the question arises whether the current policies are indeed promoting innovation or whether they are instead a symptom of a pro-intellectual property (IP) culture which is blind to adverse effects. Addressing this question requires both empirical analysis (how real is the link between academic patenting and licensing and 'development' of academic research by industry?) and normative assessment (which justifications are given for the current policies and to what extent do they threaten important academic values?). After illustrating the major rise of academic patenting and licensing in the US and Europe and commenting on the increasing trend of 'upstream' patenting and the focus on exclusive as opposed to non-exclusive licences, this paper will discuss five negative effects of these trends. Subsequently, the question as to why policymakers seem to ignore these adverse effects will be addressed. Finally, a number of proposals for improving university policies will be made.

Hansson, Sven Ove
Do we need a special ethics for research?
Science and engineering ethics 2011 Mar; 17(1): 21-9
Abstract: Research is subject to more stringent ethical requirements than most other human activities, and a procedure that is otherwise allowed may be forbidden in research. Hence, risk-taking is more restricted in scientific research than in most non-research contexts, and privacy is better protected in scientific questionnaires than in marketing surveys. Potential arguments for this difference are scrutinized. The case in its favour appears to be
A stronger case can be made in favour of a difference in the opposite direction: If perilous or otherwise problematic activities have to be performed it is usually better to perform them in a research context where they are properly evaluated so that guidance is obtained for the future. However, retreating from current ethical demands on research is not a desirable direction to go. Instead, research ethics can serve to inspire the introduction of more stringent ethical principles in other social sectors.

Murphy, Eric J

Are you a good citizen of science?
Lipids 2011 Mar; 46(3): 207

Resnik, David B; Shamoo, Adil E

The Singapore Statement on research integrity.
Accountability in research 2011 Mar; 18(2): 71-5

van Gorp, A.; van der Molen, S.
Parallel, embedded or just part of the team: ethicists cooperating within a European security research project
Science and Engineering Ethics 2011 March; 17(1): 31-43

Hansson, S.O.
Do we need a special ethics for research?
Science and Engineering Ethics 2011 March; 17(1): 21-29

Scudellari, Megan
Whistleblower protections for US government scientists flounder.
Nature medicine 2011 Mar; 17(3): 234

Neuman, Stephanie A; Long, Timothy R; Rose, Steven H
Publication misrepresentation among anesthesiology residency applicants.
Abstract: Publication misrepresentation has been documented among applicants for residency positions in several specialties. However, these data are not available for anesthesiology applicants. Our purpose in this study was to document the prevalence of publication misrepresentation among applicants to a single anesthesiology residency, to compare anesthesiology publication misrepresentation data with similar data in other specialties, and to determine how often publication misrepresentation leads to an unfair competitive advantage in the application process.

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 88
Förstermann, Ulrich
Research oversight in Germany: safeguards and shortcomings.
Anesthesia and analgesia 2011 Mar; 112(3): 504-6

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 89
Reinhart, Konrad; Takala, Jukka
Hydroxyethyl starches: what do we still know?
Anesthesia and analgesia 2011 Mar; 112(3): 507-11

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 90
Shafer, Steven L
You will be caught.
Anesthesia and analgesia 2011 Mar; 112(3): 491-3

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 91
Okike, Kanu; Kocher, Mininder S; Torpey, Jennifer L; Nwachukwu, Benedict U; Mehlman, Charles T; Bhandari, Mohit
Level of evidence and conflict of interest disclosure associated with higher citation rates in orthopedics.
Journal of clinical epidemiology 2011 Mar; 64(3): 331-8

Abstract: To identify the scientific and nonscientific factors associated with rates of citation in the orthopedic literature.

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 92
Findings of research misconduct.
NIH guide for grants and contracts (Online) 2011 Feb 11: NOT-OD-11-044

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-11-044.html (link may be outdated)
Document 93
Green, Malcolm
**MMR scare. Robust procedures for research conduct are needed.**
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2011 February 8; 342: d805
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

Document 94
Bates, Tom
**MMR scare. In the wake of Wakefield.**
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2011 February 8; 342: d806
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

Document 95
Kennedy, Ian
**MMR scare. Response from the UK Research Integrity Office.**
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2011 February 8; 342: d807
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

Document 96
Dyer, Clare
**Researcher didn't get ethical approval for 68 studies, investigators say.**
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2011 February 7; 342: d833
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

Document 97
Baserga, Renato
**Self-plagiarism in music and science.**
Nature 2011 Feb 3; 470(7332): 39
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

Document 98
Horner, Jennifer; Minifie, Fred D
**Research ethics III: Publication practices and authorship, conflicts of interest, and research misconduct.**
Abstract: In this series of articles—Research Ethics I, Research Ethics II, and Research Ethics III—the authors provide a comprehensive review of the 9 core domains for the responsible conduct of research (RCR) as articulated by the Office of Research Integrity.
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text
Schwinn, Debra A

2010 Walter C. Randall lecture in biomedical ethics. Scientific integrity: positive & negative academic/industry relationships.
The Physiologist 2011 Feb; 54(1): 1, 3-8

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Bosch, Xavier

Treat ghostwriting as misconduct.
Nature 2011 Jan 27; 469(7331): 472

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Tooke, John; Price, David

MMR scare: UCL's response.
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2011 January 25; 342: d460

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Hayes, Stephen F

MMR scare: Piltdown—hoax or fraud?
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2011 January 25; 342: d469

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Fried, Avraham

Point of credulity. Professor McLachian's fraud.
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2011 January 19; 342: d289

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Opel, Douglas J; Diekema, Douglas S; Marcuse, Edgar K

Assuring research integrity in the wake of Wakefield.
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2011 January 18; 342: d2

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
Deer, Brian
**Secrets of the MMR scare. How the vaccine crisis was meant to make money.**
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2011 January 11; 342: c5258

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text
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Deer, Brian
**How the case against the MMR vaccine was fixed.**
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2011 January 5; 342: c5347

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text
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Godlee, Fiona; Smith, Jane; Marcovitch, Harvey
**Wakefield's article linking MMR vaccine and autism was fraudulent.**
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2011 January 5; 342: c7452

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text
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Rifai, Nader; Plebani, Mario; Wu, Alan; Brugnara, Carlo; Delvin, Edgard; Lamb, Edmund J; Ness, Paul M; Wick, Mark R; Berg, Jens P
**Full-disclosure in industry-sponsored laboratory medicine research studies: statement by the Consortium of Laboratory Medicine Journal Editors.**
Clinical chemistry and laboratory medicine : CCLM / FESCC 2011 Jan; 49(1): 3-4

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text
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Satyanarayana, S
**Unethical practices in scientific publications.**

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text
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Satyanarayana, K
**Sanctions for authors of plagiarized Surgery for Obesity and Related Diseases article.**
Surgery for obesity and related diseases : official journal of the American Society for Bariatric Surgery 2011 Jan-Feb; 7(1): 125

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text
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Satyanarayana, K
**Dual dual-use research of concern: publish and perish?**
Document 112

Anderson, Melissa S; Steneck, Nicholas H

**The problem of plagiarism.**

Urologic oncology 2011 Jan-Feb; 29(1): 90-4

**Abstract:** Plagiarism is a form of research misconduct and a serious violation of the norms of science. It is the misrepresentation of another's ideas or words as one's own, without proper acknowledgement of the original source. Certain aspects of plagiarism make it less straightforward than this definition suggests. Over the past 30 years, the U.S. Federal Government has developed and refined its policies on misconduct, and Federal agencies, as well as research institutions, have established approaches to responding to allegations and instances of plagiarism. At present, efforts to avert plagiarism focus on plagiarism-detection software and instructional strategies.

Document 113

Heitman, Elizabeth; Litewka, Sergio

**International perspectives on plagiarism and considerations for teaching international trainees.**

Urologic oncology 2011 Jan-Feb; 29(1): 104-8

**Abstract:** In the increasingly global community of biomedical science and graduate science education, many U.S. academic researchers work with international trainees whose views on scientific writing and plagiarism can be strikingly different from U.S. norms. Although a growing number of countries and international professional organizations identify plagiarism as research misconduct, many international trainees come from research environments where plagiarism is ill-defined and even commonly practiced. Two research-ethics educators consider current perspectives on plagiarism around the world and contend that U.S. research-training programs should focus on trainees' scientific writing skills and acculturation, not simply on preventing plagiarism.

Document 114

Pitak-Arnnop, Poramate; Dhanuthai, Kittipong; Hemprich, Alexander; Pausch, Niels Christian

**Research and publication ethics: what have we learned thus far?**

Oral surgery, oral medicine, oral pathology, oral radiology, and endodontics 2011 Jan; 111(1): 10-2

Document 115

Rossaint, R; Zwissler, B

**[Original scientific articles: conception, accomplishment and publication]. = Wissenschaftliche Originalarbeiten : Konzeption, Durchführung und Publikation.**

Der Anaesthesist 2011 Jan; 60(1): 5-7

Document 116

Brassington, Iain
Defending the duty to research?
Bioethics 2011 Jan; 25(1): 21-6

Abstract: In 2005, John Harris published a paper in the Journal of Medical Ethics in which he claimed that there was a duty to support scientific research. With Sarah Chan, he defended his claims against criticisms in this journal in 2008. In this paper I examine the defence, and claim that it is not powerful. Although he has established a slightly stronger position, it is not clear that the defence is sufficiently strong to show that there is a duty to support scientific research. Important questions about fairness, about rescue, and about the relationship between reasons and obligations to act can still be raised; and these questions are important enough to destabilize the defence.
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Document 117

Ju, Brian L; Miller, Christopher P; Whang, Peter G; Grauer, Jonathan N

Quantifying the variability of financial disclosure information reported by authors presenting at annual spine conferences.

Abstract: In recent years, greater attention has been directed toward determining how potential financial conflicts of interest may affect the integrity of biomedical research. To address this issue, various disclosure policies have been adopted in an attempt to increase the transparency of this process. However, the consistency of such reporting among spine surgeons remains unknown. This study quantifies the variability in the self-reported disclosures of individual authors presenting at multiple spine conferences during the same year.
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Document 118

Ghanayem, Alexander J

Conflicting disclosure of conflicts of interest among spine societies: a cause for concern or an opportunity to evolve?
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Document 119

Combating scientific misconduct.
Nature cell biology 2011 Jan; 13(1): 1

Abstract: The pressures of an increasingly competitive research environment can lead to scientific misconduct. Journals, academic institutions and individual scientists should commit to promoting best practice in research and education in research ethics.
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Document 120

The Lab
Office of Research Integrity, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Abstract: This interactive educational resource addresses Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) topics including avoiding research misconduct, mentorship responsibilities, handling of data, responsible authorship, and questionable research practices. Viewers may assume one of four roles to gain perspective on the ethical issues and pressures raised while working in a research laboratory and pursuing a scientific career. Kim Park is a fourth-year graduate student who questions the use of her data by another researcher; Hardik Rao is a postdoctoral student who needs to balance work and competitiveness in an up-and-coming lab with demands of home and personal life; Aaron Hutchins is a principal investigator who falters under the overwhelming pressures he faces as a professor,
researcher, and grantwriter; and Beth Ridgely is a research administrator and also serves as the University's Research Integrity Officer (RIO); she must deal with allegations of research misconduct. (NOTE: See also the ORI's 2009 DVD on the Role of the Research Integrity Officer.)

http://ori.hhs.gov/TheLab/ (link may be outdated)

Document 121
National Research Council (United States). Committee on Education on Dual Use Issues in the Life Sciences CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR EDUCATION ABOUT DUAL USE ISSUES IN THE LIFE SCIENCES
Call number: QH332.C42 2011

http://www.nap.edu (link may be outdated)

Document 122
Reich, Eugenie Samuel
Integrity policy unveiled at last.
Nature 2010 Dec 23; 468(7327): 1009-10

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 123
Retraction: End-of-life discontinuation of destination therapy with cardiac and ventilatory support medical devices: physician-assisted death or allowing the patient to die? BMC Medical Ethics 2010, 11:15.
BMC medical ethics 2010 December 21; 11: 20
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Document 124
Findings of research misconduct.
NIH guide for grants and contracts (Online) 2010 Dec 17: NOT-OD-11-031
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Document 125
Berg, Siv Frøydis
[Created by knowledge]. = Skapt av viten.
Tidsskrift for den Norske lægeforening : tidsskrift for praktisk medicin, ny række 2010 Dec 16; 130(24): 2499-503
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Document 126
Reich, Eugenie Samuel
Self-plagiarism case prompts calls for agencies to tighten rules.
Nature 2010 Dec 9; 468(7325): 745
Document 127

Dahlberg, John E; Davidian, Nancy M

**Scientific forensics: how the Office of Research Integrity can assist institutional investigations of research misconduct during oversight review.**

Science and engineering ethics 2010 Dec; 16(4): 713-35

**Abstract:** The Division of Investigative Oversight within the U.S. Office of Research Integrity (ORI) is responsible for conducting oversight review of institutional inquiries and investigations of possible research misconduct. It is also responsible for determining whether Public Health Service findings of research misconduct are warranted. Although ORI findings rely primarily on the scope and quality of the institution's analyses and determinations, ORI often has been able to strengthen the original findings by employing a variety of analytical methods, often computer based. Although ORI does not conduct inquiries or investigations, it has broad authority to provide assistance to institutions at all stages of their reviews of allegations. This assistance can range from providing advice on best practices, to legal assistance, to suggestions for how best to investigate specific allegations. When asked, ORI can also conduct certain forensic analyses, such as a statistical examination of questioned digits or a simple examination of a questioned figure in Photoshop. ORI will not provide opinions or render judgment on such analyses while the institution is still conducting its investigation. Such analyses can be done without knowing much else about the case.

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

Document 128

Gunsalus, C K

**Best practices in communicating best practices: Commentary on: 'Developing and communicating responsible data management policies to trainees and colleagues'.**

Science and engineering ethics 2010 Dec; 16(4): 763-7

**Abstract:** We send messages as much in how we communicate as by what we communicate. Learning best practices, such as those for data management proposed in the accompanying article, are components of becoming a responsible and contributing member of the community of scholars. Not only must we teach the principles underlying best practices, we should model and teach approaches for implementing those practices and help students come to view them within the larger context of becoming members of a professional community. How to collaborate across differences and how to have disputes professionally are skills all professionals need, and they should be taught along with the content itself.
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Document 129

Tilden, Samuel J

**Incarceration, restitution, and lifetime debarment: legal consequences of scientific misconduct in the Eric Poehlman case: Commentary on: "Scientific forensics: how the office of research integrity can assist institutional investigations of research misconduct during oversight review".**

Science and engineering ethics 2010 Dec; 16(4): 737-41

**Abstract:** Following its determination of a finding of scientific misconduct the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) will seek redress for any injury sustained. Several remedies both administrative and statutory may be available depending on the strength of the evidentiary findings of the misconduct investigation. Pursuant to federal regulations administrative remedies are primarily remedial in nature and designed to protect the integrity of the affected research program, whereas statutory remedies including civil fines and criminal penalties are designed to deter and punish wrongdoers. This commentary discusses the available administrative and statutory remedies in the context of a specific case, that of former University of Vermont nutrition researcher Eric Poehlman, and supplies a possible rationale for the legal result.
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Document 130
Reider, Bruce
Under surveillance.
The American journal of sports medicine 2010 Dec; 38(12): 2391-3
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 131
Fiss, Alyssa LaForme; McCoy, Sarah Westcott; Bartlett, Doreen J; Chiarello, Lisa Ann; Palisano, Robert J; Stoskopf, Barbara; Jeffries, Lynn; Yocum, Allison; Wood, Audrey
Sharing of lessons learned from multisite research.
Pediatric physical therapy: the official publication of the Section on Pediatrics of the American Physical Therapy Association 2010 Winter; 22(4): 408-16
Abstract: PURPOSE: To highlight key considerations for planning and implementing multisite research based on experiences and reflections in conducting a large, international, multisite study. DESCRIPTION: Successes and challenges encountered throughout a multisite study process, and collective recommendations for future researchers are presented. Considerations addressed include creation of the research team and a "community of practice," study preparation and management time, approval by institutional review boards, training of future researchers, recruitment and retention of participants, and dissemination and translation of study materials to consumers. IMPORTANCE TO MEMBERS: Multisite research has the potential to create knowledge for pediatric physical therapy through collaboration among knowledgeable researchers and expert practitioners and by increasing the potential for generalization of findings. Effective planning, including anticipation of challenges, is critical to a successful study. Our collective experiences may assist practitioners and researchers in planning, implementing, and completing future multisite studies.
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Document 132
Tilden, S.J.
Incarceration, restitution, and lifetime debarment: legal consequences of scientific misconduct in the Eric Poehlman case
Science and Engineering Ethics 2010 December; 16(4): 737-741
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 133
Dahlberg, J.E.; Davidian, N.M.
Scientific forensics: how the Office of Research Integrity can assist institutional investigations of research misconduct during oversity review
Science and Engineering Ethics 2010 December; 16(4): 713-735
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 134
Giffels, J.; Vollmer, S.H.; Bird, S.J.
Editors' overview: topics in the responsible management of research data
Science and Engineering Ethics 2010 December; 16(4): 631-637
Document 135

Ratner, Mark
Crossing the line.

Document 136

Yentis, S M
Another kind of ethics: from corrections to retractions.
Anaesthesia 2010 Dec; 65(12): 1163-6

Document 137

Retractions of the year.
Nature medicine 2010 Dec; 16(12): 1363

Document 138

Beswick, Daniel M; Man, Li-Xing; Johnston, Bruce A; Johnson, Jonas T; Schaitkin, Barry M
Publication misrepresentation among otolaryngology residency applicants.
Abstract: To assess the extent of research publication misrepresentation among otolaryngology residency applicants and to determine applicant attributes associated with misrepresentation.

Document 139

Blesch, Gregg
Whistle-blowing pays off. Fraud settlements bring in $2.5 billion for feds.
Modern healthcare 2010 Nov 29; 40(48): 12

Document 140

Gibson, Elaine
Concepts of bias and appointments to the Governing Council of the Canadian Institutes of Health Research.
CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne 2010 Nov 23; 182(17): E793-5
Document 141

Berlin, Leonard
Re: "On the more insidious manifestations of bias in scientific reporting".

Document 142

Kopitowski, Karin
[Evidence Based Medicine: shadows and lights]. = Luces y sombras de la Medicina Basada en la Evidencia.
Vertex (Buenos Aires, Argentina) 2010 Nov-Dec; 21(94): 431-5

Abstract: When taking decisions as regards patient care, based on the evidence (MBE) medicine is the conscious, wise and explicit utilization of the best available tests. The utilization of this strategy involves the recognition of the patches in the knowledge, the realization of a precise research in primary information sources, the analysis of the validity of the discoveries and their utilization in problem solving. The MBE has emerged in a frame of explosion regarding clinical research and access to the information. It has also been a response to the difficulty of keeping updated, to the increasing variability in the clinical practice, and to the non-application of measures with checked security and effectiveness. However, it is worrying the fact that a great part of the investigation tests are designed, conducted and analyzed by the pharmaceutical industry. This phenomenon has introduced a worrying distortion because it investigates what it is interesting for the pharmaceutical companies. On the other hand, financial sources mainly achieve results which are favourable to their interests, which are more spread and communicated through different mechanisms.

Document 143

Hays, Judith C
A primer on the responsibilities and abuses of scientific authorship.
Public health nursing (Boston, Mass.) 2010 Nov-Dec; 27(6): 471-3

Document 144

Froehlich, Patrick
Scientific independence of authors and of journals to their published articles.

Document 145

Schüklenk, Udo
Calling it a day on proceduralism in bioethics?
Bioethics 2010 November; 24(9): ii
Loise, Vicki; Stevens, Ashley J

The Bayh-Dole Act turns 30.
Science translational medicine 2010 Oct 6; 2(52): 52cm27

Abstract: On 12 December 1980, in the waning days of the lame duck session of the 96th Congress, the U.S. Senate passed the University and Small Business Patent Procedures Act, now known as the Bayh-Dole Act, a seemingly obscure act that allowed universities to claim title to inventions that had been made with federal funding. It is unlikely that many present that day realized what a dramatic impact that act would have. Data clearly show that it played a critical role in rejuvenating the entire U.S. economic system, transforming it from a manufacturing base to an innovation base. Yet ironically, the act has passionate critics.
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Zolin, P P

[Censored data and missing data in medical research].
Patologicheskaia fiziologiya i èksperimental'naia terapiia 2010 Oct-Dec(4): 49-52

Abstract: This paper develops methodology for statistical analysis with censored and missing data in medical research. The author gives the examples, in which the appearance of missing or censored cases is not random (nonignorable censoring mechanisms), and how to resolve the problem.
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Serious concerns related to the article entitled "Tai Chi improves physical function in older Chinese women with knee osteoarthritis".
Journal of clinical rheumatology : practical reports on rheumatic & musculoskeletal diseases 2010 Oct; 16(7): 356

Beisiegel, Ulrike
Research integrity and publication ethics.
Abstract: The basic principle for professional conduct of science in all countries and all disciplines is honesty towards oneself and towards others. Therefore it is utmost important that the scientific community prevents scientific misconduct by fostering research integrity. This commentary reports on the experience of a German 'Ombudsman' and relates it to the international concepts of good scientific practice as well as the questions of publication ethics. Biomedical research seems to be most susceptible for scientific misconduct since internationally we see many of the cases in this field. Here possible explanations for the observed misconduct are discussed as well as ways to prevent it. The intention is to both alert scientists and ultimately to adjust the scientific system in a way which allows the next generation of scientists to develop their careers in true research integrity.

Cyranoski, David
Brawl in Beijing.
Nature 2010 Sep 30; 467(7315): 511

Maher, Brendan
Research integrity: Sabotage!
Nature 2010 Sep 30; 467(7315): 516-8

Sweet, Melissa
Ethicists express concern about influence of PR firm on flu experts.
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2010 September 27; 341: c5183
Document 157

A destabilizing force.
Nature 2010 Sep 9; 467(7312): 133

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 158

Findings of scientific misconduct.
NIH guide for grants and contracts (Online) 2010 Sep 3: NOT-OD-10-130
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Document 159

Findings of research misconduct.
NIH guide for grants and contracts (Online) 2010 Sep 3: NOT-OD-10-132
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Document 160

Brummel, B.J.; Gunsalus, C.K.; Anderson, K.L.; Loui, M.C.
Development of role-play scenarios for teaching responsible conduct of research
Science and Engineering Ethics 2010 September; 16(3): 573-589
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Document 161

Ejaz, Kiran
Time to banish the three evils of medical research

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Document 162

Sekhar, D M R; Aery, Naresh Chander
Open review of science publications.
Accountability in research 2010 Sep; 17(5): 257-63

Abstract: Publication of scientific research in print is traditionally peer reviewed anonymously prior to publication, which is a time-tested process but has serious limitations. The advent of the Internet permits postpublication open review online after minimal review by the editors or the author-selected reviewers, which can be quick, that permits the authors to revise the content. Most meritorious articles published online may be selected for publication in print as annual or biennial collections.
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Document 163

Gausemeier, Bernd

Genetics as a modernization program: biological research at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institutes and the political economy of the Nazi State.

Historical studies in the natural sciences 2010 Fall; 40(4): 429-56

Abstract: During the Third Reich, the biological institutes of the Kaiser Wilhelm Society (KWG, Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft) underwent a substantial reorganization and modernization. This paper discusses the development of projects in the fields of biochemical genetics, virus research, radiation genetics, and plant genetics that were initiated in those years. These cases exemplify, on the one hand, the political conditions for biological research in the Nazi state. They highlight how leading scientists advanced their projects by building close ties with politicians and science-funding organizations and companies. On the other hand, the study examines how the contents of research were shaped by, and how they contributed to, the aims and needs of the political economy of the Nazi system. This paper therefore aims not only to highlight basic aspects of scientific development under Nazism, but also to provide general insights into the structure of the Third Reich and the dynamics of its war economy.
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Document 164

Fedigan, Linda Marie

Ethical issues faced by field primatologists: asking the relevant questions.

American journal of primatology 2010 Sep; 72(9): 754-71

Abstract: Field primatologists face unusual ethical issues. We study animals rather than people and receive research approval from animal care rather than ethics committees. However, animal care evaluation forms are developed from concerns about laboratory animal research and are based on the "Three R's" for humane treatment of captive experimental subjects (replacement, reduction and refinement), which are only debatably relevant to field research. Scientists who study wild, free-ranging primates in host countries experience many ethical dilemmas seldom dealt with in animal care forms. This paper reviews the ethical issues many field primatologists say they face and how these might be better addressed by animal care forms. The ethical issues arising for field researchers are divided into three categories: "Presence, Protocols and People" and for each the most frequent issues are described. The most commonly mentioned ethical concern arising from our presence in the field is the possibility of disease transmission. Although most primate field studies employ only observational protocols, the practice of habituating our study animals to close human presence is an ethical concern for many since it can lessen the animals' fear of all humans, thereby facilitating undesirable behaviors (e.g., crop-raiding) and rendering them vulnerable to harm. Field primatologists who work in host countries must observe national laws and local traditions. As conservationists, primatologists must often negotiate between the resource needs and cultural practices of local people and the interests of the nonhuman primates. Many say they face more ethical dilemmas arising from human interactions than from research on the animals per se. This review concludes with suggestions for relevant questions to ask on animal care forms, and actions that field primatologists can take to better inform animal care committees about the common ethical issues we experience as well as how to develop guidelines for addressing them.
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Document 165

Strier, Karen B

Long-term field studies: positive impacts and unintended consequences.

American journal of primatology 2010 Sep; 72(9): 772-8

Abstract: Long-term field studies of wild primates can have far-reaching impacts that transcend their contributions to science. These impacts can benefit not only the study animals, study areas, and local human communities, but they can also have unintended, potentially negative consequences. Examples of some of the positive impacts from the Northern Muriqui Project of Caratinga, in Minas Gerais, Brazil, include contributions to conservation efforts on behalf of this critically endangered species, capacity building through the training of Brazilian students, and employment opportunities for local people through our collaboration with a locally administered NGO that is facilitating ecotourism, education, and reforestation programs. Some concerns about unintended consequences of the research include the
effects of our trails and trail traffic on surrounding vegetation and other aspects of the environmental "footprints" that both long-term researchers and short-term visitors may leave. In addition, although precautions against potential health risks from routine exposure to human observers are now standard protocol, little is known about the other ways in which our long-term research presence can affect the primates' experiences or alter their perceptions of their social and ecological environments. Risk analysis, which weighs both the positive and negative impacts can provide useful perspectives for addressing the ethical considerations that can arise during long-term field studies.
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Document 166

Garber, P A; Molina, A; Molina, R L

Putting the community back in community ecology and education: the role of field schools and private reserves in the ethical training of primatologists.

American journal of primatology 2010 Sep; 72(9): 785-93

Abstract: In 1993 and 1999, with the assistance of a Nicaraguan family, we founded La Suerte Biological Research Station in northeastern Costa Rica and Ometepe Biological Research Station in southern Nicaragua as a privately owned conservation-oriented business. Our goal was to develop a program of sustainable community ecology focused on education, research, and the conservation of primates and tropical forests. In order to accomplish this we developed field courses in which undergraduate and graduate students conduct scientific research, experience local cultures, and learn about conservation. Over 120 of these students have received doctoral degrees or are currently in graduate programs. Four doctoral dissertations, several MA theses, and some 20 scientific articles have been published based on research conducted at our field stations. In order to achieve our long-term goals of preserving the environment, we also needed to engage directly with local communities to address their needs and concerns. To this end, we developed a series of community-based initiatives related to health care, bilingual education, and conservation education using traditional and on-line teaching tools. In this article, we describe our efforts in Costa Rica and Nicaragua teaching conservation-oriented field courses and working with the local human communities. Building upon these experiences, we outline a set of ethical considerations and responsibilities for private reserves, conservation-oriented businesses, NGOs, and conservancies that help integrate members of the local community as stakeholders in conservation.
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Document 167

Collateral damage.

Nature 2010 Aug 26; 466(7310): 1023
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Document 168

Moore, John P

Misconduct: don't penalize the honest majority of scientists.

Nature 2010 Aug 26; 466(7310): 1040
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Document 169

Hettinger, Thomas P

Misconduct: don't assume science is self-correcting.

Nature 2010 Aug 26; 466(7310): 1040
Document 170
Michalek, Arthur M; Hutson, Alan D; Wicher, Camille P; Trump, Donald L
**The costs and underappreciated consequences of research misconduct: a case study.**
PLoS medicine 2010 August 17; 7(8): e1000318

Document 171
Kleinert, Sabine
**Singapore embraces international research integrity.**
Lancet 2010 Aug 7; 376(9739): 400-1

Document 172
**Making the most of peer review.**
Nature nanotechnology 2010 Aug; 5(8): 553
*Abstract:* The 'climategate' controversy exposed aspects of the peer review process that are normally kept secret, and has prompted a discussion on ways to improve peer review.

Document 173
Weissmann, Gerald
**The midwife toad and Alma Mahler: epigenetics or a matter of deception?**

Document 174
**Findings of research misconduct.**
NIH guide for grants and contracts (Online) 2010 Jul 30; (): NOT-OD-10-118

Document 175
Mascarelli, Amanda
**Freedom of spill research threatened.**
Nature 2010 Jul 29; 466(7306): 538
Deangelis, Catherine D; Fontanarosa, Phil B

**Strengthening the credibility of clinical research.**
Lancet 2010 Jul 24; 376(9737): 234
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Koocher, Gerald P; Keith-Spiegel, Patricia

**Peers nip misconduct in the bud.**
Nature 2010 Jul 22; 466(7305): 438-40
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Janvier, Annie

**Raising money for cystic fibrosis: At what price?**
CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne 2010 Jul 13; 182(10): 1079
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Noordin, Shahryar; Wright, James G; Howard, Andrew

**Relationship between declared funding support and level of evidence.**

**Abstract:** The relationship between industry and the orthopaedic community is under increasing scrutiny. Industry traditionally has funded a substantial amount of the orthopaedic research published in this and other journals. The objective of the present study was to investigate associations between the level of evidence and declared source(s) of funding in papers published in the American volume of The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery.
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Chapman, Simon

**Competing interests. The odium of industry engagement.**
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2010 July 7; 341: c3575
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Riis, Povl

**Publishing ethics--about intermediating science understandably and reliably** = Publikationsetik--om at formidle videnskab forståeligt og trovaerligt.
Tidsskrift for den Norske lægeforening : tidsskrift for praktisk medicin, ny række 2010 Jul 1; 130(13): 1359-61
Document 182
Jain, Anil K
**Ethical issues in scientific publication.**
Indian journal of orthopaedics 2010 Jul; 44(3): 235-7

Document 183
Kressel, Herbert Y; Olmsted, William W
**Conflict of interest disclosure in RSNA journals: adoption of the International Council of Medical Journal Editors uniform format.**

Document 184
Calhoun, Tess; Wood, Ben D
**Reporting academic misconduct.**

Document 185
Shermer, Michael
**When scientists sin.**
Scientific American 2010 Jul; 303(1): 34

Document 186
Shermer, Michael
**When scientists sin.**
Scientific American 2010 Jul; 303(1): 34

Document 187
Martinson, Brian C
**Re Kumar, "A theoretical comparison of the models of prevention of research misconduct".**
Accountability in research 2010 Jul; 17(4): 171-3; author reply 174-5
Influences on authorship issues: an evaluation of receiving, not receiving, and rejecting credit.

Abstract: A survey on credit issues was conducted of academic chemists in Ph.D. granting institutions in the United States. Six-hundred faculty members responded representing 16% of the survey recipients. Fifty percent of the respondents reported not receiving appropriate credit for contributions they had made to published projects. Neither the number of years after receiving their Ph.D., their fields of expertise, their total number of publications, nor their total number of single-author publications showed any significant relationship with the perception of not receiving appropriate credit. Twenty percent of the respondents had discovered that they were an author of a paper, after that paper had been submitted to a journal. Forty-nine percent percent reported that they had asked to have their name deleted as an author. Relationships between these perceptions and academic background factors were examined. For example, respondents who had asked to be removed from authorship were more likely to give authorship or an acknowledgement to others and were also more likely to have had an authorship problem with others, both of these factors being related to longevity as a publishing scientist.
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Key personnel and "long distance" settings: determining who must report financial conflict of interest.

Abstract: Conflicts of interest (COIs) can impact the integrity of scientific research. While public imagination has focused on scientists, regulatory discourse recognizes a broader range of individuals who might have financial COIs. This essay asks, for personnel who enroll subjects at a physical and organizational remove from the primary research team, whether reporting COI to an institutional review board or COI committee protects research integrity. After examining definitions of COI, regulations on COI, and rubrics for evaluating COI policies, we argue that requiring recruitment personnel who work at a distance from the primary research team to report potential COI protects neither research integrity nor human subjects.
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Consensus statement on the adoption of the COPE guidelines.
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Managing financial conflict of interest in biomedical research.
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Rockey, Sally J.; Collins, Francis S.
Managing financial conflict of interest in biomedical research.
JAMA: The Journal of the American Medical Association 2010 June 16; 303(23): 2400-2402

Neale, A.V.; Dailey, R.K.; Abrams, J.
Analysis of citations to biomedical articles affected by scientific misconduct.
Science and Engineering Ethics 2010 June; 16(2): 251-261

Ramos, Flávia Regina Souza; Finkler, Mirelle; Gonçalves, Evelise Ribeiro; Caetano, João Carlos
[The ethics of qualitative research in health: the said and the unsaid in the scientific production]. = A eticidade na pesquisa qualitativa em saúde: o dito e o não dito nas produções científicas.
Ciência & saúde coletiva 2010 Jun; 15 Suppl 1: 1673-84

Neale, Anne Victoria; Dailey, Rhonda K; Abrams, Judith
Analysis of citations to biomedical articles affected by scientific misconduct.
Science and engineering ethics 2010 Jun; 16(2): 251-61

Abstract: We describe the ongoing citations to biomedical articles affected by scientific misconduct, and characterize the papers that cite these affected articles. The citations to 102 articles named in official findings of scientific misconduct during the period of 1993 and 2001 were identified through the Institute for Scientific Information Web of Science database. Using a stratified random sampling strategy, we performed a content analysis of 603 of the 5,393 citing papers to identify indications of awareness that the cited articles affected by scientific misconduct had validity issues, and to examine how the citing papers referred to the affected articles. Fewer than 5% of citing papers indicated any awareness that the cited article was retracted or named in a finding of misconduct.
We also tested the hypothesis that affected articles would have fewer citations than a comparison sample; this was not supported. Most articles affected by misconduct were published in basic science journals, and we found little cause for concern that such articles may have affected clinical equipoise or clinical care.
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**Document 197**

Kottow, Miguel

**Ethical quandaries posing as conflicts of interest.**


**Abstract:** Conflicts of interest are receiving increased attention in medical research, clinical practice and education. Criticism of, and penalties for, conflicts of interest have been insufficiently discussed and have been applied without adequate conceptual backing. Genuine conflicts of interest are situations in which alternative courses of action are ethically equivalent, decision-making being less a matter of moral deliberation than of personal weighing of interest. In contrast, situations usually thought of as conflicts of interest are mostly temptations to follow an attractive but undue option that causes harm by failing to uphold well-entrenched ethical standards. Examples of moral quandaries that pose as ethically neutral conflicts of interest are healthcare providers enticed to favour certain products; patients being referred to non-therapeutic trials entailing risks and non-optimal healthcare; industry-supported scientists failing to deliver unbiased research results and reports or participating in ghost-writing; and sponsored educators who praise their supporters beyond objective evidence. All these are moral blemishes, where integrity gives way to material incentives at the cost of provoking risky and harm-producing situations, thus constituting false conflicts of interest when they are in fact ethical misdemeanours. Disclosure has been the most widely recommended response to avoid the concealment of conflicting and ethically suspect interests. Regulations regarding disclosure reveal a utilitarian stance that shows more concern for the magnitude of support or sponsorship than for the underlying ethical transgression. Education and oversight should directly address and help correct the moral attitude towards undue influence of inducements and marketing strategies falsely posing as conflicts of interest.

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

---

**Document 198**

Wayne, Katherine; Glass, Kathleen Cranley

**The research imperative revisited: considerations for advancing the debate surrounding medical research as moral imperative.**

Perspectives in biology and medicine 2010 Summer; 53(3): 373-87

**Abstract:** Medical research is frequently regarded as not only laudable, but even obligatory. However, the moral foundation for such an obligation is far from clear. Lively debate concerning the viability of an obligation to conduct and support medical research is transpiring among a small number of scholars speaking from a variety of backgrounds, yet the current discussion is predominantly situated within several discrete academic and professional circles, allowing only sporadic engagement within and between scholarly disciplines and the medical realm. We aim to lay the groundwork for a focused critique of the "research imperative" by examining (1) its commitments within ideologies of science, medicine, and progress; and (2) its normative theoretical underpinnings. Our analysis finds no solid grounding for the research imperative and exposes problems in the attitudes and arguments supporting it. We believe these concerns present compelling reasons for devoting greater critical attention to the research imperative and to the morality of the medical research enterprise as a whole.
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**Document 199**

Scanes, Colin G

**Lessons in empowerment: transparency.**

Poultry science 2010 Jun; 89(6): 1093
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'Mis-investigating alleged research misconduct can have dire consequences' and 'Regulating research, regulating professionals'.
Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine 2010 Jun; 103(6): 213; author reply 213-4
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Research misconduct: Dr Grethe Stoa Birketvedt not guilty of scientific misconduct.
Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine 2010 Jun; 103(6): 214
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NIH set to tighten financial rules for researchers.
Nature 2010 May 27; 465(7297): 407
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Findings of misconduct in science.
NIH Guide for Grants and Contracts (Online) 2010 May 14; NOT-OD-10-095
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Oversight of financial conflicts of interest in commercially sponsored research in academic and nonacademic settings.
Journal of general internal medicine 2010 May; 25(5): 460-4
Abstract: Studies of conflicts of interest in clinical research have focused on academic centers, but most clinical research takes place in nonacademic settings.
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O'Connor, S J

What do duplicate publications; self-plagiarism and the monotony of endless descriptive studies signify: publication pressures or simply a collective lack of imagination?

European journal of cancer care 2010 May; 19(3): 281-3
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Document 207

Malek, Janet

To tell or not to tell? The ethical dilemma of the would-be whistleblower.

Accountability in research 2010 May; 17(3): 115-29

Abstract: Despite the growing emphasis placed on the responsible conduct of research, little attention has been devoted to the question of what an individual should do upon discovering research misconduct. This article takes seriously the dilemma of a would-be whistleblower. It identifies ethical considerations that can be taken into account in moral decision-making about reporting research misconduct. It also offers rough guidelines about the moral significance of each consideration in the decision-making process based on the facts of the case in question. The article, therefore, offers tools for a would-be whistleblower to use to arrive at a defensible resolution to a difficult dilemma.
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Document 208

Kjellström, Sofia; Fridlund, Bengt;

Literature review: status and trends of research ethics in Swedish nurses' dissertations.

Nursing ethics 2010 May; 17(3): 383-92

Abstract: Research ethics is increasingly formally regulated, but little is known about how ethical considerations are reported in dissertations. The aim of this literature study was to describe the status and trends of ethical considerations in Swedish doctoral dissertations written by registered nurses. A total of 77 dissertations from 1987, 1997, and 2007 met the inclusion criteria and were analyzed by descriptive statistics. Ethical considerations were mostly overlooked in 1987, but almost ubiquitous by 2007. All dissertations in 2007, except one, had a section on ethical considerations; however, these were short, lacking in references, and short on content. The most common topic was informed consent and approval from research ethics review boards, followed by confidentiality and ethical aspects of methodological issues. Our results imply that the quantity and quality of ethical considerations must be improved in order to assure ethical soundness for participants, patients, researchers, and society.
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Bergman, Richard N

Truth or consequences?

Obesity (Silver Spring, Md.) 2010 May; 18(5): 859-61
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Of faith and reason.

Nature immunology 2010 May; 11(5): 357
Document 211
Nilstun, Tore; Löfmark, Rurik; Lundqvist, Anita
Scientific dishonesty–questionnaire to doctoral students in Sweden.
Journal of medical ethics 2010 May; 36(5): 315-8
Abstract: 'Scientific dishonesty' implies the fabrication, falsification or plagiarism in proposing, performing or reviewing research or in reporting research results. A questionnaire was given to postgraduate students at the medical faculties in Sweden who attended a course in research ethics during the academic year 2008/2009 and 58% answered (range 29%-100%). Less than one-third of the respondents wrote that they had heard about scientific dishonesty in the previous 12 months. Pressure, concerning in what order the author should be mentioned, was reported by about 1 in 10 students. We suggest that all departments conducting research should have a written policy about acceptable research behaviour and that all doctoral students should be informed of the content of this policy. Participants in the research groups concerned should also be required to analyse published articles about scientific dishonesty and critically discuss what could be done about unethical conduct.
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Scanes, Colin G
Lessons in empowerment: honesty is essential for trust.
Poultry science 2010 May; 89(5): 859

Document 213
Campbell, Eric G.
Public disclosure of conflicts of interest: moving the policy debate forward.
Archives of Internal Medicine 2010 April 26; 170(8): 667

Document 214
Licurse, Adam; Barber, Emma; Joffe, Steve; Gross, Cary
The impact of disclosing financial ties in research and clinical care: a systematic review.
Archives of Internal Medicine 2010 April 26; 170(8): 675-682
Abstract: BACKGROUND: Despite increased demand for disclosure of physician and researcher financial ties (FTs) to industry, little is known about patients', research participants', or journal readers' attitudes toward FTs. METHODS: We systematically reviewed original, quantitative studies of patients', research participants', or journal readers' views about FTs to pharmaceutical and medical device companies. The MEDLINE, Scopus, and Web of Knowledge databases were searched for English-language studies containing original, quantitative data on attitudes toward FTs. We screened 6561 citations and retrieved 244 potentially eligible abstracts. Of these, 20 met inclusion criteria. RESULTS: Eleven studies assessed FTs and perceptions of quality. In clinical care, patients believed FTs decreased the quality and increased the cost of care. In research, FTs affected perceptions of study quality. In 2 studies, readers' perceptions of journal article quality decreased after disclosure of FTs. Eight studies assessed the acceptability of FTs. Patients were more likely to view personal gifts to physicians as unacceptable, compared with professional gifts. In 6 of the 10 studies that assessed the importance of disclosure, most patients and research participants believed FTs should be disclosed; in the other 4, approximately one-quarter believed FTs should be disclosed. Among the 7 studies assessing willingness to participate in research, approximately one-quarter of participants reported less willingness after disclosure of FTs. CONCLUSIONS: Patients believe that FTs influence professional behavior and should be disclosed. Patients, physicians, and research participants believe FTs decrease
the quality of research evidence, and, for some, knowledge of FTs would affect willingness to participate in research.
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Document 215

Fanelli, Daniele

Do pressures to publish increase scientists' bias? An empirical support from US States Data.

PloS one 2010 April 21; 5(4): e10271

Abstract: The growing competition and "publish or perish" culture in academia might conflict with the objectivity and integrity of research, because it forces scientists to produce "publishable" results at all costs. Papers are less likely to be published and to be cited if they report "negative" results (results that fail to support the tested hypothesis). Therefore, if publication pressures increase scientific bias, the frequency of "positive" results in the literature should be higher in the more competitive and "productive" academic environments. This study verified this hypothesis by measuring the frequency of positive results in a large random sample of papers with a corresponding author based in the US. Across all disciplines, papers were more likely to support a tested hypothesis if their corresponding authors were working in states that, according to NSF data, produced more academic papers per capita. The size of this effect increased when controlling for state's per capita R&D expenditure and for study characteristics that previous research showed to correlate with the frequency of positive results, including discipline and methodology. Although the confounding effect of institutions' prestige could not be excluded (researchers in the more productive universities could be the most clever and successful in their experiments), these results support the hypothesis that competitive academic environments increase not only scientists' productivity but also their bias. The same phenomenon might be observed in other countries where academic competition and pressures to publish are high.
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Strengthening the credibility of clinical research.

Lancet 2010 April 10; 375(9722): 1225

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 217

Radulescu, Razvan T.; Fischer, Klaus; Stange, Eduard; Schulze, Johannes

Promoting scientific standards in Germany.

Science 2010 April 16; 328(5976): 307
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Findings of research misconduct.

NIH Guide for Grants and Contracts (Online) 2010 April 16: NOT-OD-10-084
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Findings of research misconduct.
Document 220

Bossi, Emilio

**Scientific integrity, misconduct in science.**
Swiss medical weekly : official journal of the Swiss Society of Infectious Diseases, the Swiss Society of Internal Medicine, the Swiss Society of Pneumology 2010 Apr 3; 140(13-14): 183-6
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Document 221

Abbasi, Kamran

**The CNEP [Continuous Negative Extrathoracic Pressure] trial: how a good trial was turned rotten.**
Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine 2010 Apr; 103(4): 121-2
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Document 222

Dixon-Woods, Mary

**Regulating research, regulating professionals.**
Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine 2010 Apr; 103(4): 125-6
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Document 223

Hey, Edmund; Chalmers, Iain

**Mis-investigating alleged research misconduct can cause widespread, unpredictable damage.**
Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine 2010 Apr; 103(4): 133-8
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Document 224

Cribb, Alan

**Translational ethics? The theory-practice gap in medical ethics.**
Journal of medical ethics 2010 Apr; 36(4): 207-10

**Abstract:** Translational research is now a critically important current in academic medicine. Researchers in all health-related fields are being encouraged not only to demonstrate the potential benefits of their research but also to help identify the steps through which their research might be 'made practical'. This paper considers the prospects of a corresponding movement of 'translational ethics'. Some of the advantages and disadvantages of focusing upon the translation of ethical scholarship are reviewed. While emphasising the difficulties of crossing the gap between scholarship and practice, the paper concludes that a debate about the business of translation would be useful for medical ethics.
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García-Doval, I

[Inappropriate references in "Oral leukoplakia: Definition of clinical, histopathologic, and molecular features and therapeutic approach" pertaining to the Sudbo fraud] = Citas inadecuadas en "La leucoplasia oral: Definición de parámetros clínicos, histopatológicos y moleculares y actitud terapéutica" referentes al fraude Sudbo.
Actas dermo-sifiliográficas 2010 Apr; 101(3): 284; author reply 284
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Document 226
Cronstein, Bruce N

Interest in conflicts.
Clinical and translational science 2010 Apr ; 3(2): 52-3
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Document 227
Korpela, K M

How long does it take for the scientific literature to purge itself of fraudulent material?: the Breuning case revisited.
Current medical research and opinion 2010 Apr ; 26(4): 843-7

Abstract: OBJECTIVE: It has been proposed that the scientific literature purges itself of articles known to be fraudulent. To test this, an investigation was carried out of post-retraction citations over a 19-year period in the Breuning case. METHODS: On 10 March 2008 a cited reference search was conducted (all languages, all document types) using the name 'Breuning SE*'. The time limit was 1989-2007 with an option to exclude self-citations. The search included the ISI Web of Science Database including the Science Citation Index Expanded, the Social Sciences Citations Index and the Arts & Humanities Citation Index. To ascertain the citation context, citations of Breuning were classified by two raters as affirmative, negative or neutral. FINDINGS: For the period 1989-2000 both negative and affirmative citations were found. For the period 2001-2006 only affirmative citations (even to retracted articles) were found, some in journals with higher impact factors than those citing the case as fraudulent. In spite of the small number of citations of Breuning's articles, it is alarming that the affirmative citing of fraudulent research has not completely ceased but continues 24 years post-retraction (retracted 1982, cited 2006). While the limitations of a single case study are conceded, the results challenge the belief of scientific literature purging itself of fraudulent material. CONCLUSIONS: Retraction databases and widespread availability of computer software to check lists of references free of charge in any database or the internet are called for. Moreover, if a paper is never formally retracted, software for searching author names in the internet for fully investigated and proven scientific misconduct might be developed. The ethical guidelines on duplicate publication for purposes of disseminating the information as widely as possible should be reviewed.
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Moore, R.A.; Derry, S.; McQuay, H.J.

Fraud or flawed: adverse impact of fabricated or poor quality research.
Anaesthesia 2010 April; 65(4): 327-330
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**Authors' response.** **Appearances count when industry underwrites research.**
American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics 2010 April; 137(4): 444-446
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**Document 230**
Benestad, Haakon Breien

[Scientific misconduct--serious, intentional or grossly negligent?] = Vitenskapelig uredelighet -- alvorlig, forsketlig eller grovt uaksomt?
Tidsskrift for den Norske Lægeforening: Tidsskrift for Praktisk Medicin, ny Række 2010 March 11; 130(5): 515-516
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**Document 231**
Olson, Lynne E

**Developing a framework for assessing responsible conduct of research education programs.**
Science and engineering ethics 2010 Mar ; 16(1): 185-200

**Abstract:** Education in the responsible conduct of research (RCR) in the United States has evolved over the past decade from targeting trainees to including educational efforts aimed at faculty and staff. In addition RCR education has become more focused as federal agencies have moved to recommend specific content and to mandate education in certain areas. RCR education has therefore become a research-compliance issue necessitating the development of policies and the commitment of resources to develop or expand systems for educating faculty and staff and for assuring compliance. These changes implied the need to develop a program evaluation model that could be applied to institutional RCR education programs, which were expected to differ from traditional academic credit-bearing courses targeting trainees. Information gleaned from the examination of corporate compliance models was analyzed in order to create a program evaluation module that could be used to document and assess educational programs focused on teaching RCR. A programmed series of questions for each of the nine RCR content areas identified by the United States Office of Research Integrity was created based on a performance-monitoring evaluation model. The questions focus on educational goals, resources provided to support the educational efforts, educational content, content delivery, educational outcomes, compliance requirements and feedback. Answers collected in response to the questions could be used to both document and continually improve the quality of RCR educational programs through on-going formative assessment and feedback.
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**Document 233**
Kumar, Malhar N

**A theoretical comparison of the models of prevention of research misconduct.**
Accountability in research 2010 Mar ; 17(2): 51-66

**Abstract:** The current methods of dealing with research misconduct involve detection and rectification after the
incident has already occurred. This method of monitoring scientific integrity exerts considerable negative effects on the concerned persons and is also wasteful of time and resources. Time has arrived for research administrators to focus seriously on prevention of misconduct. In this article, preventive models suggested earlier by Weed and Reason have been combined to arrive at six models of prevention. This is an effort to streamline the thinking regarding misconduct prevention, so that the advantages and disadvantages of each can be weighed and the method most appropriate for the institute chosen.
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Document 234

Bluhm, Robyn L; Downie, Jocelyn; Nisker, Jeff

Dr. Cézanne and the art of re(peat)search: competing interests and obligations in clinical research.

Accountability in research 2010 Mar; 17(2): 85-95

Abstract: Clinician researchers have a number of roles, each of which carries specific obligations. There are times when these obligations may be in competition (up to and including conflict) with each other. Using a narrative case study that describes a group of colleagues discussing their clinical department's participation in an industry-sponsored research protocol, we illustrate a number of the obligations faced by clinician researchers, and discuss how competing interests and obligations can lead to ethical problems. The case study is followed by a discussion of the effect of university-industry relations on competing interests and obligations in both clinical research and the role of the university, and a suggested framework that could be used to determine when university involvement in commercial research is ethically acceptable.
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Fabrication, falsification et Al.
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Document 236

Lexchin, Joel; O'Donovan, Orla

Prohibiting or 'managing' conflict of interest? A review of policies and procedures in three European drug regulation agencies.

Social Science & Medicine 2010 March; 70(5): 643-647

Abstract: In light of debates about the relationship between interests and scientific expert judgments, and the potential for declarations of conflict of interest (COI) to minimize corporate bias, we reviewed the approach to COI in 3 European drug regulatory bodies. These bodies were the Irish Medicines Board, the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency in the United Kingdom and the European Medicines Agency in the European Union. Official statements about COI laws and codes of practice in the 3 contexts suggest that COIs are prohibited. In practice, the approaches to COI in the 3 drug regulatory agencies presuppose and promote the ideas that COIs cannot and need not be eliminated as the risk of bias can be managed. Because the evidence about if and how COI affects micro-level decision-making in drug regulatory authorities is neither complete nor comprehensive, we advocate a precautionary principle model. Under this model COI would be prohibited on the grounds that it might influence the outcome of regulatory decisions.
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Document 238

Goldenring, James R.

**Perspective: Innocence and due diligence: managing unfounded allegations of scientific misconduct.**

Academic Medicine 2010 March; 85(3): 527-530

**Abstract:** While the incidence of fraud in science is well documented, issues related to the establishment of innocence in cases of fallacious allegations remain unaddressed. In this article, the author uses his own experience to examine issues that arise when investigators are falsely accused of scientific fraud. Investigators must understand the processes in place to protect themselves against false accusations. The present system takes a position of guilty until proven innocent, a concept that is antithetical to American principles of jurisprudence. Yet this stance is acceptable as a requirement for membership in the scientific community, more reflective of the rules within a guild organization. The necessity for proof of innocence by members of the scientific community carries obligations that transcend normal legal assumptions. Scientists must safeguard their reputations by organizing and maintaining all original image files and data relevant to publications and grant proposals. Investigators must be able to provide clear documentation rapidly whenever concerns are raised during the review process. Moreover, peer-reviewed journals must be diligent not only in the identification of fraud but also in providing rapid due process for adjudication of allegations. The success of the scientific guild rules of conduct lies in the practice of due diligence by both scientists and journal editors in questions of scientific misconduct.
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Drummond, G.B.; Loadsman, J.A.

**Conflicts of interest and medical publishing: the Private Eye test.**

Anaesthesia and Intensive Care 2010 March; 38(2): 241-243
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**Findings of misconduct in science.**

NIH Guide for Grants and Contracts (Online) 2010 February 5; NOT-OD-10-058
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Ncayiyana, Daniel J

**‘Truth’ in medical journal publishing.**

South African medical journal = Suid-Afrikaanse tydskrif vir geneeskunde 2010 Feb; 100(2): 71-2
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Marcovitch, Harvey; Barbour, Virginia; Borrell, Carme; Bosch, Felix; Fernández, Esteve; Macdonald, Helen; Marusic,
Ana; Nylenna, Magne
Conflict of interest in science communication: more than a financial issue. Report from Esteve Foundation Discussion Group, April 2009.
Croatian medical journal 2010 Feb ; 51(1): 7-15

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 243
Swan, Melanie
Translational antiaging research.
Rejuvenation research 2010 Feb ; 13(1): 115-7
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Document 244
Stenius, Kerstin; Babor, Thomas F
The alcohol industry and public interest science.
Abstract: AIMS: This report argues that the growing involvement of the alcohol industry in scientific research needs to be acknowledged and addressed. It suggests a set of principles to guide ethical decision-making in the future. METHODS: We review relevant issues with regard to relationships between the alcohol industry and the international academic community, especially alcohol research scientists. The guiding principles proposed are modelled after expert committee statements, and describe the responsibilities of governmental agencies, the alcohol industry, journal editors and the academic community. These are followed by recommendations designed to inform individuals and institutions about current 'best practices' that are consistent with the principles. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS: Growing evidence from the tobacco, pharmaceutical and medical fields suggests that financial interests of researchers may compromise their professional judgement and lead to research results that are biased in favour of commercial interests. It is recommended that the integrity of alcohol science is best served if all financial relationships with the alcoholic beverage industry are avoided. In cases where research funding, consulting, writing assignments and other activities are initiated, institutions, individuals and the alcoholic beverage industry itself are urged to follow appropriate guidelines that will increase the transparency and ethicality of such relationships.
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Conflicts of interest. A golden standard to generalize in addiction research.
Addiction (Abingdon, England) 2010 Feb ; 105(2): 199-200; author reply 205-6
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Protecting the integrity of shared scientific knowledge: is the conflict of interest statement enough?
Addiction (Abingdon, England) 2010 Feb ; 105(2): 200-1; author reply 205-6
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**In Congress: Senator fights to combat financial conflicts of interest -- including in medical research**
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Lathyris, D.N.; Patsopoulos, N.A.; Salanti, G.; Ioannidis, J.P.A.

**Industry sponsorship and selection of comparators in randomized clinical trials.**


**Abstract:** BACKGROUND: Most clinical trials on medical interventions are sponsored by the industry. The choice of comparators shapes the accumulated evidence. We aimed to assess how often major companies sponsor trials that involve only their own products. METHODS: Studies were identified by searching ClinicalTrials.gov for trials registered in 2006. We focused on randomized trials involving the 15 companies that had sponsored the largest number of registered trials in ClinicalTrials.gov in that period. RESULTS: Overall, 577 randomized trials were eligible for analysis and 82% had a single industry sponsor [89% (166/187) of the placebo-control trials, 87% (91/105) of trials comparing different doses or ways of administration of the same intervention, and 78% (221/285) of other active control trials]. The compared intervention(s) belonged to a single company in 67% of the trials (89%, 81% and 47% in the three categories respectively). All 15 companies strongly preferred to run trials where they were the only industry sponsor or even the only owner of the assessed interventions. Co-sponsorship typically reflected co-ownership of the same intervention by both companies. Head-to-head comparison of different active interventions developed by different companies occurred in only 18 trials with two or more industry sponsors. CONCLUSIONS: Each company generates a clinical research agenda that is strongly focused on its own products, while comparisons involving different interventions from different companies are uncommon. This diminishes the ability to understand the relative merits of different interventions for the same condition.
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**Re: "data presentation bias: a source of potential error in radiology scientific publications".**

Journal of the American College of Radiology 2010 February; 7(2): 160-161
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Baerlocher, Mark Otto; O'Brien, Jeremy; Newton, Marshall; Gautam, Tina; Noble, Jason

**Data integrity, reliability and fraud in medical research.**

European Journal of Internal Medicine 2010 February; 21(1): 40-45

**Abstract:** BACKGROUND: Data reliability in original research requires collective trust from the academic community. Standards exist to ensure data integrity, but these safeguards are applied non-uniformly so errors or even fraud may
still exist in the literature. **OBJECTIVE:** To examine the prevalence and consequences of data errors, data reliability safeguards and fraudulent data among medical academics. **METHODOLOGY:** Corresponding authors of every fourth primary research paper published in the Journal of the American Medical Association (2001-2003), Canadian Medical Association Journal (2001-2003), British Medical Journal (1998-2000), and Lancet (1998-2000) were surveyed electronically. Questions focused on each author's personal experience with data reliability, data errors and data interpretation. **RESULTS:** Sixty-five percent (127/195) of corresponding authors responded. Ninety-four percent of respondents accepted full responsibility for the integrity of the last manuscript on which they were listed as co-author; however, 21% had discovered incorrect data after publication in previous manuscripts they had co-authored. Fraudulent data was discovered by 4% of respondents in their previous work. Four percent also noted 'smudged' data. Eighty-seven percent of respondents used data reliability safeguards in their last published manuscript, typically data review by multiple authors or double data entry. Twenty-one percent were involved in a paper that was submitted despite disagreement about the interpretation of the results, although the disagreeing author commonly withdrew from authorship. **CONCLUSIONS:** Data reliability remains a difficult issue in medical literature. A significant proportion of respondents did not use data reliability safeguards. Research fraud does exist in academia; however, it was not reported to be highly prevalent.
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**Awareness of industry bias (management of dysfunctional tear syndrome: a Canadian consensus. Vol. 44[4]).**
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**Bias in identifying and recruiting participants in cluster randomised trials: what can be done?**
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**A success story that isn't shapes health-care debate.**
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**Scientific fraud: action needed in China.**

Lancet 2010 January 9; 375(9709): 94
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**How we can all contribute to basic research.**
Aesthetic surgery journal / the American Society for Aesthetic Plastic Surgery 2010 Jan ; 30(1): 112
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**Black sheep among the flock of protein structures.**
Acta crystallographica. Section D, Biological crystallography 2010 Jan ; 66(Pt 1): 1
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**Update to requirements for instruction in the responsible conduct of research**
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Document 259

Levy-Malmberg, Rika; Eriksson, Katie

**Legitimizing basic research by evaluating quality.**
Nursing Ethics 2010 January; 17(1): 107-116

Abstract: The aim of this study was to use ethical arguments to strengthen the relationship between the concepts of legitimacy and evaluation. The analysis is based on the ethics of Levinas and Buber and is motivated by a sense of responsibility using dialogical ideology as a mediator. The main questions in this study consider the following: Does caring science as an independent academic discipline have the moral responsibility to develop a theory for evaluating the quality of basic research? and Will such a quality evaluation theory have a reasonable probability of introducing legitimization into caring science? On an ethical level, this study introduces a meaningful interaction inspired by social demands and is linked to the concept of research justification. Legitimization turns from an abstract idea to an achievable entity by an act. The act of evaluation has the likelihood of delegating legitimacy and empowers the foundation of caring science, which in turn will become a cornerstone of nursing. At this stage there is no intention to develop an evaluation theory, rather to create a meaningful discussion for the future development of an ethics-based theory.
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Wood, Ben D.

**Academic misconduct and detection.**
Radiologic Technology 2010 January-February; 81(3): 276-279
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Charlton, Bruce G.

**First and second things, and the operations of conscience in science.**

Medical Hypotheses 2010 January; 74(1): 1-3

**Abstract:** Why is modern science less efficient than it used to be, why has revolutionary science declined, and why has science become so dishonest? One plausible explanation behind these observations comes from an essay First and second things published by C.S. Lewis. First Things are the goals that are given priority as the primary and ultimate aim in life. Second Things are subordinate goals or aims - which are justified in terms of the extent to which they assist in pursuing First Things. The classic First Thing in human society is some kind of religious or philosophical world view. Lewis regarded it as a 'universal law' that the pursuit of a Second Thing as if it was a First Thing led inevitably to the loss of that Second Thing: 'You can't get second things by putting them first; you can get second things only by putting first things first'. I would argue that the pursuit of science as a primary value will lead to the loss of science, because science is properly a Second Thing. Because when science is conceptualized as a First Thing the bottom-line or operational definition of 'correct behaviour' is approval and high status within the scientific community. However, this does nothing whatsoever to prevent science drifting-away from its proper function; and once science has drifted then the prevailing peer consensus will tend to maintain this state of corruption. I am saying that science is a Second Thing, and ought to be subordinate to the First Thing of transcendental truth. Truth impinges on scientific practice in the form of individual conscience (noting that, of course, the strength and validity of conscience varies between scientists). When the senior scientists, whose role is to uphold standards, fail to possess or respond-to informed conscience, science will inevitably go rotten from the head downwards. What, then, motivates a scientist to act upon conscience? I believe it requires a fundamental conviction of the reality and importance of truth as an essential part of the basic purpose and meaning of life. Without some such bedrock moral underpinning, there is little possibility that individual scientific conscience would ever have a chance of holding-out against an insidious drift toward corruption enforced by peer consensus.
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**Fraud: just say no!**

Endocrinology 2010 January; 151(1): 1-3
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Habermann, Barbara; Broome, Marion; Pryor, Erica R; Ziner, Kim Wagler

**Research coordinators' experiences with scientific misconduct and research integrity.**

Nursing Research 2010 January-February; 59(1): 51-57

**Abstract:** BACKGROUND: Most reports of scientific misconduct have been focused on principal investigators and other scientists (e.g., biostatisticians) involved in the research enterprise. However, by virtue of their position, research coordinators are often closest to the research field where much of misconduct occurs. OBJECTIVE: The purpose of this study was to describe research coordinators' experiences with scientific misconduct in their clinical environment. DESIGN: The descriptive design was embedded in a larger cross-sectional national survey. A total of 266 respondents, predominately registered nurses, who answered "yes" to having firsthand knowledge of scientific misconduct in the past year, provided open-ended question responses. METHODS: Content analysis was conducted by the research team, ensuring agreement of core categories and subcategories of misconduct. FINDINGS: Research coordinators most commonly learned about misconduct via firsthand witness of the event, with the principal investigator being the person most commonly identified as the responsible party. Five major categories of misconduct were identified: protocol violations, consent violations, fabrication, falsification, and financial conflict of interest. In 70% of cases, the misconduct was reported. In most instances where misconduct was reported, some action was taken. However, in approximately 14% of cases, no action or investigation ensued; in 6.5% of cases, the coordinator was fired or he or she resigned. CONCLUSIONS: This study demonstrates the need to expand definitions of scientific misconduct beyond fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism to include other practices. The importance of the ethical climate in the institution in ensuring a safe environment to report and an environment where
Motivated by money? The impact of financial incentive for the research team on study recruitment.

Abstract: The aim of this study was to use ethical arguments to strengthen the relationship between the concepts of legitimacy and evaluation. The analysis is based on the ethics of Levinas and Buber and is motivated by a sense of responsibility using dialogical ideology as a mediator. The main questions in this study consider the following: Does caring science as an independent academic discipline have the moral responsibility to develop a theory for evaluating the quality of basic research? and Will such a quality evaluation theory have a reasonable probability of introducing legitimization into caring science? On an ethical level, this study introduces a meaningful interaction inspired by social demands and is linked to the concept of research justification. Legitimization turns from an abstract idea to an achievable entity by an act. The act of evaluation has the likelihood of delegating legitimacy and empowers the foundation of caring science, which in turn will become a cornerstone of nursing. At this stage there is no intention to develop an evaluation theory, rather to create a meaningful discussion for the future development of an ethics-based theory.

Abstract: AIM: The purpose of this article is to analyse the research papers published in Nursing in Critical Care (n = 168) over the past 15 years to examine trends in methodology, theoretical contribution and authorship. BACKGROUND: Research is a contested term and the paper starts with defining the criteria by which papers were selected for the review. METHODS: The approach undertaken was a documentary review based on an adaptation of Schatzman's dimensional analysis. Papers were loaded into a matrix then categorized and grouped to determine trends and frequency. CONCLUSION: Research papers published in the journal reflect a wide range of interests and broad spread of research methods. Qualitative and quantitative data are used by authors but to distinguish papers into these two categories would be over simplistic. Systematic reviews along with randomized control trials and studies using a quasi-experimental design are the least frequently occurring approaches in the published papers, although they are growing in number in recent years. All the papers make explicit the implications for clinical practice and as such contribute to the growing body of knowledge to inform critical care nursing practice.
Kuczewski, Mark G
Conflict of interests in biomedical research: beyond disclosure.
Annals of health law / Loyola University Chicago, School of Law, Institute for Health Law 2010; 19(1 Spec No): 103-6

Lelgemann, Monika; Sauerland, Stefan
Zeitschrift für Evidenz, Fortbildung und Qualität im Gesundheitswesen 2010; 104(4): 284-91

Torfs, Koen; Rudolph, Ina; Mehnert, Angelika; Sindem, Jörn
[Objectivity in research in the pharmaceutical industry is possible] = Objektive Forschung der Pharmaindustrie ist möglich.
Zeitschrift für Evidenz, Fortbildung und Qualität im Gesundheitswesen 2010 104(3): 177-83
Abstract: In the face of tight public budgets more and more studies are being funded by the pharmaceutical industry. At the same time responsibility for conducting company-funded trials is increasingly being shifted to contract research organisations. Pharmaceutical manufacturers sponsor trials that primarily pursue company interests. The dominance of company-funded research does not only have a bearing on the choice of study priorities, though. Company sponsorship also has an influence on the results of trials. Company-funded trials are four times more likely to find evidence in favour of the trial drug than studies funded by other sponsors. There are several contributory factors, from study design (design bias) to data manipulation. And non-publication (publication bias) can distort knowledge. As a result, it is largely impossible to reliably assess the benefit and harm of medical drugs on the basis of published trials. This will have repercussions for the reliability of meta-analyses, guidelines and patient information leaflets. One consequence may be treatment errors.
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Document 272
Gornall, Jonathan
A very public break-up.
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2010; 340: c110

Document 273
Dyer, Clare
Wakefield was dishonest and irresponsible over MMR research, says GMC.
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2010; 340: c593

Document 274
Tanne, Janice Hopkins
US specialty societies are urged to adopt code on relations with industry.
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2010; 340: c2246

Document 275
Stevenson, John C; Hodis, Howard N; Pickar, James H; Lobo, Rogerio A
Drug firm conflicting interests. If only WHI was done well.
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2010; 340: c591

Document 276
Aldis, William L.
Industry influence. Big Pharma's long tentacles.
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2010; 340: c941
Document 277
Tanne, Janice Hopkins
**US pain expert faces prison after pleading guilty to research fraud.**
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2010; 340: c1207

Document 278
Moynihan, Ray
**Rosiglitazone, marketing, and medical science.**
BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2010; 340: c1848

Document 279
Kibble, Jonathan D
**Ethical approval for research in physiology education.**
Advances in physiology education 2009 Dec; 33(4): 268-9
**Abstract:** The goal of this article is to reflect on the contemporary ethical standards that should be applied to the publication of physiology education research. As teachers, we are all education researchers to some degree but our appreciation of when and how regulatory requirements apply to our work is variable. A significant number of articles in Advances in Physiology Education that might be classified as "research involving human participants" do not document ethical safeguards such as Institutional Review Board approval and informed consent, which are required according to journal policy. I elaborate my personal view that we should strive to maintain the present community standards for conducting and publishing education research. And, as always, I hope the road to hell is not paved with good intentions!

Document 280
Hens, Kristien
**Science and Ethics. The Axiological Contexts of Science, edited by Evandro Agazzi and Fabio Minazzi [book review]**
Ethical Perspectives 2009 December; 16(4): 521-522

Document 281
Ladd, J.M.; Lappé, M.D.; McCormick, J.B Boyce, A.M.; Cho, M.K.
**The "how" and "whys" of research: life scientists' views of accountability.**
Journal of Medical Ethics 2009 December; 35(12): 762-7
**Abstract:** OBJECTIVES: To investigate life scientists' views of accountability and the ethical and societal implications of research. DESIGN: Qualitative focus group and one-on-one interviews. PARTICIPANTS: 45 Stanford
University life scientists, including graduate students, postdoctoral fellows and faculty. RESULTS: Two main themes were identified in participants' discussions of accountability: (1) the "how" of science and (2) the "why" of science. The "how" encompassed the internal conduct of research including attributes such as honesty and independence. The "why," or the motivation for conducting research, was two-tiered: first was the desire to positively impact the research community and science itself, and second was an interest in positively impacting the external community, broadly referred to as society. Participants noted that these motivations were influenced by the current systems of publications, grants and funding, thereby supporting a complex notion of boundary-setting between science and non-science. In addition, while all participants recognised the "how" of science and the two tiers of "why," scientists expressed the need to prioritise these domains of accountability. This prioritisation was related to a researcher's position in the academic career trajectory and to the researcher's subsequent "perceived proximity" to scientific or societal concerns. Our findings therefore suggest the need for institutional change to inculcate early-stage researchers with a broader awareness of the implications of their research. The peer review processes for funding and publication could be effective avenues for encouraging scientists to broaden their views of accountability to society.
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In clear sight
BMJ: British Medical Journal 2009 September 5; 339(7720): 538-540
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Document 287

Zinner, Darren E.; Campbell, Eric G.

Life-science research within US academic medical centers.
JAMA: The Journal of the American Medical Association 2009 September 2; 302(9): 969-976

Abstract: CONTEXT: Besides the generic "basic" vs "applied" labels, little information is known about the types of life-science research conducted within academic medical centers (AMCs). OBJECTIVE: To determine the relative proportion, characteristics, funding, and productivity of AMC faculty by the type of research they conduct. DESIGN: Mailed survey conducted in 2007 of 3080 life-science faculty at the 50 universities with medical schools that received the most funding from the National Institutes of Health in 2004. Response rate was 74%. SETTING AND PARTICIPANTS: Research faculty affiliated with a medical school or teaching hospital, representing 77% of respondents (n = 1663). MAIN OUTCOME MEASURES: Type of research (basic, translational, clinical trials, health services research/clinical epidemiology, multimode, other), total funding, industry funding, publications, professional activities, patenting behavior, and industry relationships. RESULTS: Among AMC research faculty, 33.6% exclusively conducted basic science research as principal investigators compared with translational researchers (9.1%), clinical trial investigators (7.1%), and health services researchers/clinical epidemiologists (9.0%). While principal investigators garnered a mean of $410,755 in total annual research funding, 22.1% of all AMC research faculty were unsponsored, a proportion that ranged from 11.5% for basic science researchers to 46.8% for health services researchers (P < .001). The average AMC faculty member received $33,417 in industry-sponsored funding, with most of this money concentrated among clinical trial ($110,869) and multimode ($59,916) principal investigators. Translational (61.3%), clinical trial (67.3%), and multimode (70.9%) researchers were significantly more likely than basic science researchers (41.9%) to report a relationship with industry and that these relationships contributed to their most important scientific work (P < .05 for all comparisons). CONCLUSION: The research function of AMCs is active and diverse, incorporating a substantial proportion of faculty who are conducting research and publishing without sponsorship.
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Document 289

Selgelid, Michael J.

Governance of dual-use research: an ethical dilemma
Bulletin of the World Health Organization 2009 September; 87(9): 720-723
Document 290
Mitra, Indraneel

Why is modern medicine stuck in a rut?
Perspectives in Biology and Medicine 2009 Autumn; 52(4): 500-517

Document 291
Kumar, Malhar N.

Dealing with misconduct in biomedical research: a review of the problems and the proposed methods for improvement
Accountability in Research 2009 September-December; 16(5-6): 307-330

Abstract: The increasing complexity of scientific research has been followed by increasing varieties of research misconduct. Dealing with misconduct involves the processes of detection, reporting, and investigation of misconduct. Each of these steps is associated with numerous problems which need to be addressed. Misconduct investigation should not stop with inquiries and disciplinary actions in specific episodes of misconduct. It is necessary to decrease the personal price paid by those who expose misconduct and to protect the personal and professional interests of honest researchers accused of misconduct unfairly or mistakenly. There is no dearth of suggestions to improve the objectivity and fairness of investigations. What is needed is the willingness to test the various options and implement the most suitable ones.

Document 292
Schmaling, Karen B.; Blume, Arthur W.

Ethics instruction increases graduate students' responsible conduct of research knowledge but not moral reasoning
Accountability in Research 2009 September-December; 16(5-6): 268-283

Abstract: The purpose of this study was to assess the short-term effectiveness of ethics courses in enhancing responsible conduct of research (RCR) knowledge and moral judgment among graduate students in health-related disciplines. Forty-eight graduate students completed a questionnaire about research experience, knowledge and judgments about appropriate research practices, and a standardized test of moral judgment at the beginning and end of a semester-long ethics course. Knowledge about RCR but not moral judgment increased significantly in some areas. The results are discussed in terms of implications for RCR instruction and of future research designed to improve RCR instruction.

Document 293

Findings of research misconduct.
NIH guide for grants and contracts (Online) 2009 Aug 21: NOT-OD-09-142
**Document 294**

Eigler, Donald

**Neglecting the Crucial "Why?"** [review of Plastic Fantastic: How the Biggest Fraud in Physics Shook the Scientific World, by Eugenie Samuel Reich]

Science 2009 July 24; 325(5939): 395
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**Obama's scientific peacemaker** [op-ed]
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Goldston, David

**Don't cry politicization: to call biomedical research proposals political distorts the issue**

Nature 2009 July 2; 460(7251): 24
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Greco, Pietro

[A public debate about the precariousness and autonomy of research in Italy]. = Un'assemblea pubblica per discutere di precariato e di autonomia della ricerca in Italia.

Epidemiologia e prevenzione 2009 Jul-Oct; 33(4-5): 139
[Policy framework for the protection of integrity in research in Brazil] = El marco normativo para la protección de la integridad en la investigación en Brasil.
Law and the human genome review = Revista de derecho y genoma humano / Chair in Law and the Human Genome, BBV Foundation-Provincial Government of Biscay, University of Deusto 2009 Jul-Dec(31): 79-106

Abstract: Beginning with the assumption that the heated tension between research freedom and the protection of human life and integrity has not been overcome, this article discusses the issue of regulatory framework for the protection of research integrity in the Brazilian legal system. Throughout the work, the general aspects and principles that establish the limits between scientific activity and the rights and interests of the subjects of experimental processes are developed, as well as the treatment deserved by certain especially problematic situations derived from the complex cultural composition of Brazilian society.
Re: Ethical studies, ethical publication.
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How do disclosure policies fail? Let us count the ways.
FASEB journal 2009 June; 23(6): 1638-1642
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Fonn, Desmond
Didn't adhere to the rules.
Eye & contact lens 2009 May; 35(3): 114
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Eisenach, James C.
Data fabrication and article retraction: how not to get lost in the woods.
Anesthesiology 2009 May; 110(5): 955-956
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Document 310

Resnik, David B.
International standards for research integrity: an idea whose time has come?
Accountability in Research 2009 May-August; 16(3-4): 218-228

Abstract: A movement to promulgate international ethics standards covering areas of conduct other than research with human subjects has now begun to gain momentum. This commentary explains why it is important to develop international research integrity standards and some of the problems that must be overcome to bring them to fruition.
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Document 311
A really serious conflict.

Regulators confront blind spots in research oversight.
Nature Medicine 2009 May; 15(5): 469

Perioperative analgesia: what do we still know?
Anesthesia and Analgesia 2009 May; 108(5): 1364-1367

Attorney General forces Infectious Diseases Society of America to redo Lyme guidelines due to flawed development process.
Journal of Medical Ethics 2009 May; 35(5): 283-288

Abstract: Lyme disease is one of the most controversial illnesses in the history of medicine. In 2006 the Connecticut Attorney General launched an antitrust investigation into the Lyme guidelines development process of the Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA). In a recent settlement with IDSA, the Attorney General noted important commercial conflicts of interest and suppression of scientific evidence that had tainted the guidelines process. This paper explores two broad ethical themes that influenced the IDSA investigation. The first is the growing problem of conflicts of interest among guidelines developers, and the second is the increasing centralisation of medical decisions by insurance companies, which use treatment guidelines as a means of controlling the practices of individual doctors and denying treatment for patients. The implications of the first-ever antitrust investigation of medical guidelines and the proposed model to remediate the tainted IDSA guidelines process are also discussed.
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Researching and teaching the ethics and social implications of emerging technologies in the laboratory
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**ACCOMPLISH and the risks with company sponsored clinical trials = ACCOMPLISH och riskerna med företagssponsrade kliniska prövningar.**
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**Shifts in guidelines for ethical scientific conduct: how public and private organizations create and change norms of research integrity.**
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Chaturvedi, Santosh K; Somashekar, B S

**Reporting ethical aspects in published research articles in the Indian Journal of Psychiatry.**

Indian journal of psychiatry 2009 Jan; 51(1): 34-7

**Abstract:** Reporting of informed consent and ethical approval are important aspects of published papers which indicate the knowledge and sensitivity about ethical aspects of research by the researchers.
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**Deja vu: a database of highly similar citations in the scientific literature.**
Nucleic Acids Research 2009 January; 37(Database issue): D921-4
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**Actitudes anticientíficas en la sociedad abierta [Anti-scientific attitudes in the open society]**

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

[http://www.catedraderechoygenomahumano.es/revista.asp](http://www.catedraderechoygenomahumano.es/revista.asp) (link may be outdated)

---

**Document 340**
Drexler, H; Schaller, K.H.

**Expression of concern.**
International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health 2009 January; 82(2): 143-144
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**'Ghostbusting' at blood.**
Blood 2009 January 15; 113(3): 502-503
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**Document 342**
White, Jenny; Bandura, Albert; Bero, Lisa A.

**Moral disengagement in the corporate world.**
Accountability in Research 2009 January-April; 16(1): 41-74

**Abstract:** We analyze mechanisms of moral disengagement used to eliminate moral consequences by industries whose products or production practices are harmful to human health. Moral disengagement removes the restraint of self-censure from harmful practices. Moral self-sanctions can be selectively disengaged from harmful activities by investing them with socially worthy purposes, sanitizing and exonerating them, displacing and diffusing responsibility, minimizing or disputing harmful consequences, making advantageous comparisons, and disparaging
and blaming critics and victims. Internal industry documents and public statements related to the research activities of these industries were coded for modes of moral disengagement by the tobacco, lead, vinyl chloride (VC), and silicosis-producing industries. All but one of the modes of moral disengagement were used by each of these industries. We present possible safeguards designed to protect the integrity of research.

Document 343
Tereskerz, Patricia M.; Hamric, Ann B.; Guterbock, Thomas M.; Moreno, Jonathan D.

Prevalence of industry support and its relationship to research integrity.
Accountability in Research 2009 January-April; 16(2): 78-105

Abstract: Most U.S. clinical trials are funded by industry. Opportunities exist for sponsors to influence research in ways that jeopardize research objectivity. The purpose of this study was to survey U.S. medical school faculty to assess financial arrangements between investigators and industry to learn about investigators’ first hand knowledge of the effects of industry sponsorship on research. Here we show first-hand knowledge that compromises occurred in: research participants’ well-being (9%), research initiatives (35%), publication of results (28%), interpretation of research data (25%), and scientific advancement (20%) because of industry support. Financial relationships with industry were prevalent and considered important to conducting respondents’ research.

Document 344
Macdonald, Chris; Williams-Jones, Bryn

Supervisor-student relations: examining the spectrum of conflicts of interest in bioscience laboratories.
Accountability in Research 2009 January-April; 16(2): 106-126

Abstract: Much attention has been given to financial conflicts of interest (COIs) in bioscience research. Yet to date, surprisingly little attention has focused on other COIs that arise in supervisor–student relations. We examine a spectrum of related situations, ranging from standard graduate supervision through to dual relationships sometimes found in research with commercial potential. We illustrate some of the less-obvious factors that can bias supervisory judgment, and situate financial COI along a spectrum of forces that are deserving of recognition. We conclude by providing two sets of recommendations: one for individual supervisors, and the other for institutions and policymakers.
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**Abstract:** Informed consent and confidentiality supposedly minimize harm for research participants in all qualitative research methodologies, inclusive of one-on-one unstructured interviews and focus groups. This is not the case for the latter. Confidentiality and informed consent uniquely manifest themselves as endemic ethical dilemmas for focus group researchers. The principle of caveat emptor (let the buyer beware) may be a more useful tool for those involved in focus group research: that is, let the researcher, the participants and the ethics committee beware that the only ethical assurance that can be given to focus group participants is that there are few ethical assurances. These ethical dilemmas are not sufficiently realized in the literature, and if they are discussed, they are often dealt with within the focus group moderator's preamble to the group discussion. This paper encourages the mandatory use of a participant information sheet sufficiently detailed to engender the participant's active consent. Sufficient here means the participant must be made adequately aware of these endemic ethical dilemmas in advance, to allow them to consent to share responsibility for any ensuing harm. The focus group moderator is not their sole protector.
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Abstract: One interesting aspect of the Hwang-case has been the way in which this affair was assessed by academic journals such as Nature. Initially, Hwang’s success was regarded as evidence for the detrimental effects of research ethics, slowing down the pace of research in Western countries. Eventually, however, Hwang’s debacle was seen as evidence for the importance of ethics in the life sciences. Ironically, it was concluded that the West maintains its prominence in science (as a global endeavour) precisely because it has its ethics in place. Bioethics was now seen as an indispensable part of quality control. In this article, I will claim that the Hwang case rather reveals that there is no reason for complacency and that there are substantial challenges awaiting us. They have to do with major transformations in the way knowledge is produced and research in the life sciences is conducted (such as the increase in pace and scale, globalisation and the growing importance of ICT and bioinformation). These transformations call for a different kind of bioethics. The focus must shift from duties of autonomous researchers concerning visible research subjects (“micro-ethics”) to responsibilities of institutionalised research networks in
managing and processing large amounts of bioinformation ("macro-ethics"). Concepts such as transparency, reliability and benefit-sharing will become more important than concepts such as informed consent. Basically, it is a resurgence of the tension between the Kantian and the Hegelian view of ethics. The contours of macro-ethics will be elaborated notably as it is emerging in bioethical debates over biobanking and genetic databanks.
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**Abstract:** In the past decade, the perception of a bioterrorist threat has increased and created a demand on life scientists to consider the potential security implications of dual use research. This article examines a selection of proposed moral obligations for life scientists that have emerged to meet these concerns and the extent to which they can be considered reasonable. It also describes the underlying reasons for the concerns, how they are managed, and their implications for scientific values. Five criteria for what constitutes preventable harm are suggested and a number of proposed obligations for life scientists are considered against these criteria, namely, the obligations to prevent bioterrorism; to engage in response activities; to consider negative implications of research; not to publish or share sensitive information; to oversee and limit access to dangerous material; and to report activities of concern. Although bioterrorism might be perceived as an imminent threat, the analysis illustrates that this is beyond the responsibility of life scientists either to prevent or to respond to. Among the more reasonable obligations are duties to consider potential negative implications of one's research, protect access to sensitive material, technology and knowledge, and report activities of concern. Responsibility, therefore, includes obligations concerned with preventing foreseeable and highly probable harm. A central conclusion is that several of the proposed obligations are reasonable, although not unconditionally.
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Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 445

Chapman, Audrey R.; Maienschein, Jane; Sunderland, Mary; Ankeny, Rachel A.; Robert, Jason Scott

The potential contributions of translational research and ethics [comment]

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

http://bioethics.net (link may be outdated)
Schwab, Abraham P.; Satin, David J.; Maienschein, Jane; Sunderland, Mary; Ankeny, Rachel A.; Robert, Jason Scott

The realistic costs and benefits of translational research [comment]
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Expedited industry-sponsored translational research: a seductive but hazardous cocktail? [comment]
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Selling translational research: is science a value-neutral autonomous enterprise? [comment]
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The ethos and ethics of translational research

Abstract: Calls for the "translation" of research from bench to bedside are increasingly demanding. What is translation, and why does it matter? We sketch the recent history of outcome-oriented translational research in the United States, with a particular focus on the Roadmap Initiative of the National Institutes of Health (Bethesda, MD). Our main example of contemporary translational research is stem cell research, which has superseded genomics as the translational object of choice. We explore the nature of and obstacles to translational research and assess the ethical and biomedical challenges of embracing a translational ethos.
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Sharing data and experience: using the clinical and translational science award (CTSA) “Moral Community” to improve research ethics consultation [comment]
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Research ethics consultations: a Canadian perspective using research ethicists [comment]
American Journal of Bioethics 2008 March; 8(3): 35-37, author reply W4-W6
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Our two cents: research ethics consultation at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health [comment]
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Toward a comprehensive research ethics consultation service [comment]
American Journal of Bioethics 2008 March; 8(3): 31-32, author reply W4-W6
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Even stranger still: moral experience as significant focus for research ethics consultation [comment]
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Experts at the benchside [comment]
American Journal of Bioethics 2008 March; 8(3): 20-21, author reply W4-W6
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Jonsen, Albert R.; Cho, Mildred K.; Tobin, Sara L.; Greely, Henry T.; McCormick, Jennifer; Boyce, Angie; Magnus, David
Any help from strangers at the benchside? [comment]
American Journal of Bioethics 2008 March; 8(3): 19-20, author reply W4-W6
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Document 460
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Conflicts of interest in research ethics consultation: where to go from here? [comment]
American Journal of Bioethics 2008 March; 8(3): 17-18, author reply W4-W6

Strangers no more: genuine interdisciplinarity [comment]
American Journal of Bioethics 2008 March; 8(3): 16-17, author reply W4-W6

Keeping society from the benchside [comment]
American Journal of Bioethics 2008 March; 8(3): 14-16, author reply W4-W6

Strangers at the benchside: research ethics consultation
American Journal of Bioethics 2008 March; 8(3): 4-13

Abstract: Institutional ethics consultation services for biomedical scientists have begun to proliferate, especially for clinical researchers. We discuss several models of ethics consultation and describe a team-based approach used at Stanford University in the context of these models. As research ethics consultation services expand, there are many unresolved questions that need to be addressed, including what the scope, composition, and purpose of such services should be, whether core competencies for consultants can and should be defined, and how conflicts of interest should be mitigated. We make preliminary recommendations for the structure and process of research ethics consultation, based on our initial experiences in a pilot program.

Is there an effective approach to deterring students from plagiarizing?
Science and Engineering Ethics 2008 March; 14(1): 139-147
Kligyte, Vykinta; Marcy, Richard T.; Sevier, Sydney T.; Godfrey, Elaine S.; Mumford, Michael D.

A qualitative approach to responsible conduct of research (RCR) training development: identification of metacognitive strategies
Science and Engineering Ethics 2008 March; 14(1): 3-31

Saunders, R.; Savulescu, Julian

Research ethics and lessons from Hwanggate: what can we learn from the Korean cloning fraud?
Journal of Medical Ethics 2008 March; 34(3): 214-221

Abstract: In this review of the Korean cloning scandal involving Woo-Suk Hwang, the nature of the disaster is documented and reasons why it occurred are suggested. The general problems it raises for scientific research are highlighted and six possible ways of improving practice are offered in the light of this case: (1) better education of science students; (2) independent monitoring and validation; (3) guidelines for tissue donation for research; (4) fostering of debate about ethically contentious research in science journals; (5) development of an international code of ethical research practice; (6) fostering of public involvement in ethical review and debate through the web.

Kushner, Howard I.

The art of medicine: history as a medical tool
Lancet 2008 February 16-22; 371(9612): 552-553

Gray, Nigel J.

Dilemmas over tobacco research [comment]
Lancet 2008 February 2-8; 371(9610): 368-370

Brainard, Jeffrey

NIH turns blind eye to academics' financial conflicts, audit says
Chronicle of Higher Education 2008 February 1; 54(21): A8
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When the quest for truth falters: the issue of scientific misconduct
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* Document 475
Elliott, Kevin C.
Abstract: This article argues that the three major elements of typical university conflict-of-interest (COI) policies (i.e., disclosure, management, and elimination of conflicts via divestiture or recusal) are likely to be insufficient for screening out many worrisome influences of financial COIs. Current psychological research challenges the effectiveness of disclosure, management plans are unlikely to address the wide range of ways that financial COIs can influence scientific judgment, and it is often impractical to eliminate conflicts. Identifying the limits of these policies highlights the importance of considering alternative strategies, such as encouraging more independently funded research, in order to maintain the integrity of science.
medical universities, 9 research centers, Pasteur Institute, molecular research and stem cells networks, and members of national research ethics committee. Participants were divided into 5 groups based on their proficiency and management scopes and edited the task's descriptions. These groups included: 1) task's description for ethics committee of universities; 2) task's description for research executive managers and research deputies of universities and research centers; 3) task's description for professors, executors, managers, research deputies of departments and research council's department; 4) task's description for international relationship committees of universities; 5) task's description for publishing committees. These 5 groups were chosen deliberatively. Considering importance of bioethics, interference of environmental and sociological factors, local area culture and existence of executive facilities, providing practical codes of ethics needs group assistance and researchers' national impetus, research affairs accomplishment and massive country management.
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Reporting science and conflicts of interest in the lay press.  
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Threats to the integrity of the Croatian Medical Journal.  
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Beyond scientific rigour: funding cancer research of public value  
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Goulden, Murray  
*Bringing bones to life: how science made Piltdown Man human*  
Science as Culture 2007 December; 16(4): 333-357
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Kitcher, Philip  
*Reply to Talisse and Aikin*  
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Talisse, Robert B.; Aikin, Scott F.  
*Kitcher on the ethics of inquiry*  
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Thrush, Carol R.; Vander Putten, Jim; Rapp, Carla Gene; Pearson, L. Carolyn; Berry, Katherine Simms; O’Sullivan, Patricia S.  
*Content validation of the Organizational Climate for Research Integrity (OCRI) Survey*  

**Document 496**

Antes, Alison L.; Brown, Ryan P.; Murphy, Stephen T.; Waples, Ethan P.; Mumford, Michael D.; Connelly, Shane; Devenport, Lynn D.  
*Personality and ethical decision-making in research: the role of perceptions of self and others*  
The complex, multifaceted nature of ethical decision-making in scientific research. The results revealed that narcissism and cynicism (individual differences influencing self-perceptions and perceptions of others) showed consistently negative relationships with aspects of ethical decision-making, whereas more basic personality characteristics (e.g., conscientiousness, agreeableness) were less consistent and weaker. Further analyses examined the relationship of personality to metacognitive reasoning strategies and social behavioral response patterns thought to underlie ethical decision-making. The findings indicated that personality was associated with many of these social-cognitive mechanisms which might, in part, explain the association between personality and ethical decisions.
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Document 497
Anderson, Melissa S.; Martinson, Brian C.; De Vries, Raymond
**Normative dissonance in science: results from a national survey of U.S. scientists**

*Abstract:* NORMS OF BEHAVIOR IN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH represent ideals to which most scientists subscribe. Our analysis of the extent of dissonance between these widely espoused ideals and scientists' perceptions of their own and others' behavior is based on survey responses from 3,247 mid- and early-career scientists who had research funding from the U.S. National Institutes of Health. We found substantial normative dissonance, particularly between espoused ideals and respondents' perceptions of other scientists' typical behavior. Also, respondents on average saw other scientists' behavior as more counternormative than normative. Scientists' views of their fields as cooperative or competitive were associated with their normative perspectives, with competitive fields showing more counternormative behavior. The high levels of normative dissonance documented here represent a persistent source of stress in science.
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Improving translational biomedical research in Chile [comment]
Lancet 2007 November 10-16; 370(9599): 1598-1599
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A timely harvest. The public should be consulted on contentious research and development early enough for their opinions to influence the course of science and policy-making
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Rules of engagement. Is there an inherent conflict between public debate and free scientific inquiry?
Nature 2007 November 8; 450(7167): 163-164
**Document 507**
Reider, Bruce

*Passing the headline test.*

**Document 508**
Marcovitch, Harvey

*Misconduct by researchers and authors*
Gaceta Sanitaria / S.E.S.P.A.S 2007 November-December; 21(6): 492-499

**Document 509**
Gorman, Dennis M.; Conde, Eugenia

*Conflict of interest in the evaluation and dissemination of “model” school-based drug and violence prevention programs.*
Evaluation and Program Planning 2007 November; 30(4): 422-429

**Document 510**
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*A finding of scientific misconduct*
Human Research Report 2007 November; 22(11): 11
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*Adverse effects of inhaled corticosteroids in funded and unfunded studies*
Archives of Internal Medicine 2007 October 22; 167(19): 2047-2053

**Abstract:** BACKGROUND: Evidence regarding the safety profile of drugs may vary depending on study sponsorship. We aimed to evaluate differences between studies funded by the pharmaceutical manufacturer of the drug (PF) and those with no pharmaceutical funding (NoPF) regarding the finding and interpretation of adverse effects of inhaled corticosteroids. METHODS: We assessed the safety reporting of inhaled corticosteroids in 275 PF and 229 NoPF studies identified by a MEDLINE search using prespecified criteria. RESULTS: Overall, the finding of statistically significant differences for adverse effects was significantly less frequent in PF (34.5%) than in NoPF (65.1%) studies (prevalence ratio, 0.53; 95% confidence interval, 0.44-0.64). This association became nonsignificant (prevalence ratio, 0.94; 95% confidence interval, 0.77-1.15) after controlling for design features (such as dose or use of parallel groups) that tended to be associated with less frequent finding of adverse effects and were more common
in PF studies. Among studies finding a statistically significant increase in adverse effects associated with the study drug, the authors of PF articles concluded that the drug was "safe" more frequently than the authors of NoPF studies (prevalence ratio, 3.68; 95% confidence interval, 2.14-6.33). CONCLUSIONS: The type of funding may have determinant effects on the design of studies and on the interpretation of findings: funding by the industry is associated with design features less likely to lead to finding statistically significant adverse effects and with a more favorable clinical interpretation of such findings. Disclosure of conflicts of interest should be strengthened for a more balanced opinion on the safety of drugs.
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Research integrity: collaboration and research needed [comment]
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Human Research Report 2007 October; 22(10): 11
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In Congress: Congress suspects conflicts of interest at agency
Human Research Report 2007 October; 22(10): 9
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Crow, Michael M.
Research funding in the twenty-first century [review of Science for Sale: The Perils, Rewards and Delusions of Campus Capitalism by Daniel S. Greenberg]
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Document 528
Scheetz, Mary D.
The Teaching Scholars Program: a proposed approach for promoting research integrity
Abstract: All research environments are not created equal. They possess their own unique communication style, culture, and professional mores. Coupled with these distinct professional nuances is the fact that research
collaborations today span not only a campus, but also the globe. While the opportunities for cross cultural collaborations are invaluable, they may present challenges that result in misunderstandings about how a research idea should be studied and the findings presented. Such misunderstandings are sometimes found at the center of research misconduct cases. And yet in light of highly visible cases of research misconduct, the attitude about ensuring research integrity remains rather opaque. This paper discusses the merits of the Teaching Scholars Program as a mechanism by which to promote research integrity. This paper will examine this education program against the backdrop of the US Office of Research Integrity (ORI), as an established office responsible for ensuring the integrity of federally funded biomedical and behavioral research.
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**Document 529**

Lind, Rebecca Ann; Lepper, Tammy Swenson

**Sensitivity to research misconduct: a conceptual model**


**Abstract:** Ethical sensitivity research suggests techniques for assessing people's sensitivity to research misconduct (RM). Based on our prior work in assessing ethical sensitivity, we present a conceptual model for assessing RM sensitivity. We propose conceptual and operational definitions of RM sensitivity (RMsen), and consider how the construct could be measured. RMsen is conceptualized as a cognitive ability, a skill which can be learned and assessed. RMsen involves an awareness that the research situation presents the possibility for misconduct to occur, and that one may have to decide what is right or wrong in the situation. Indicators of RMsen can take many forms and represent multiple content domains and dimensions. Four main content domains of RMsen are situational characteristics, RM issues, consequences, and stakeholders. In addition, linkages are potential connections made among elements in the different content domains. Three dimensions applicable to assessing RMsen include time, breadth, and depth. Although our focus is on RMsen, we believe that our model and methods may be extended to assessing sensitivity to the responsible conduct of research.
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**Document 530**

Faunce, Thomas Alured; Jefferys, Susannah

**Whistleblowing and scientific misconduct: renewing legal and virtue ethics foundations**


**Abstract:** Whistleblowing in relation to scientific research misconduct, despite the benefits of increased transparency and accountability it often has brought to society and the discipline of science itself, remains generally regarded as a pariah activity by many of the most influential relevant organizations. The motivations of whistleblowers and those supporting them continued to be questioned and their actions criticised by colleagues and management, despite statutory protections for reasonable disclosures appropriately made in good faith and for the public interest. One reason for this paradoxical position, explored here, is that whistle blowing concerning scientific misconduct lacks the policy support customarily derived from firm bioethical and jurisprudential foundations. Recommendations are made for altering this situation in the public interest.
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**Document 531**

Wager, Elizabeth

**What do journal editors do when they suspect research misconduct?**


**Abstract:** Several published guidelines urge journal editors to ensure that cases of suspected scientific misconduct are properly investigated. Using cases submitted to the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) I tried to discover what editors actually do when faced with such cases. Of the 79 cases referred to COPE between 1998 and 2003 relating to author misconduct, 33 related to redundant publication, 16 to unethical research, 13 to fabrication, 10 to clinical misconduct and 7 to plagiarism. Outcomes were reported in 49 cases. Authors were exonerated in 16 cases
and reprimanded in another 17. An impasse (no or an unsatisfactory response) was reached in 16. Editors contacted the authors' institutions in 24 cases. Nearly half the cases (36) lasted over a year. This small survey highlights the difficulties faced by editors in pursuing cases of suspected misconduct and the need for better training and guidance for editors and more cooperation from institutions.

* Article  Document 532

Daroff, Robert B.

**Scientific misconduct and breach of publication ethics: one editor's experience**


**Abstract:** I summarize my experience with scientific misconduct and breach of publication ethics during my 10 year term as Editor-in-Chief and my first 3 years as Scientific Integrity Advisor for Neurology, the official publication of the American Academy of Neurology. I describe in some detail the highly publicized, lengthy saga involving the accusation from a former colleague that James Abbs falsified data in an article published in Neurology. Nine years later, after numerous investigations and law suits, Abbs was found to have engaged in scientific misconduct which prompted the retraction of the article. Most of the problems I encountered were less complex and involved claims of plagiarism (regarded as "scientific misconduct") and self plagiarism (regarded as a "breach of publication ethics"). I conclude by providing helpful sources for editors in dealing with these infractions.

* Article  Document 533

Fletcher, Robert H.; Black, Bert

**"Spin" in scientific writing: scientific mischief and legal jeopardy**


**Abstract:** In science, the data are supposed to speak for themselves. However, investigators have great latitude in how they report their results in the medical literature, even in an era of research protocols, pre-specified endpoints, reporting guidelines, and rigorous peer review. Authors' personal agendas, such as financial, personal, and intellectual conflicts of interest, can and sometimes do color how research results are described. Articles in peer-reviewed medical journals are the evidence base not only for the care of patients but also for legal decisions and the scientific record may be tailored for legal reasons as well. Journal editors preside over where and how the results of scientific research are published. We therefore suggest some actions that editors can take to foster a more trustworthy evidence base both for the care of patients and for legal decisions.

* Article  Document 534

Spece, Roy G.; Bernstein, Carol

**What is scientific misconduct, who has to (dis)prove it, and to what level of certainty?**


**Abstract:** This article traces the regulation of [U.S.] Public Health Service ("PHS")-funded research from changes begun with the proposal (1999) and then adoption (2000) of a basic, Uniform Federal ("research misconduct") Policy. It argues that the PHS misconduct regulations deny due process of law and are fundamentally unfair because they fail to specify the level of culpability for guilt, force accused researchers to prove that they are innocent, and, although admittedly quasi-criminal, adopt a standard of proof that tolerates nearly a 50 percent probability of false convictions. The regulations' infirmities will be demonstrated by applying them to facts relating to the central charge in the misconduct case pressed by the University of Arizona in 1997 through 2003 against then Arizona Regents' Professor Marquerite Kay, which facts are set forth in our companion piece in this theme issue.
Document 535

Spece, Roy G.; Bernstein, Carol

**Scientific misconduct and liability for the acts of others**


**Abstract:** We argue that two ambiguities in [U.S.] Public Health Service ("PHS") misconduct regulations make them so vague that they are unconstitutional and unfair: (1) they provide no guidance concerning when one can be held responsible for others' actions; and (2) they simultaneously are intended to allow misconduct findings only when there are "significant departure[s] from established practices of the relevant research community" but even if one complied with customary standards of practice in her research community, thus providing confusion rather than guidance. The effect of these ambiguities is not only to leave researchers without notice as to proscribed or prescribed conduct but also to give officials discretion to apply the regulations arbitrarily and discriminatorily. The regulations' effect is illustrated by applying them, hypothetically, to facts relating to the central charge in the misconduct case pressed by the University of Arizona in 1997 through 2003 against then Arizona Regents' Professor Marquie Kay.
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Catano, Victor M.; Turk, James

**Fraud and misconduct in scientific research: a definition and procedures for investigation**


**Abstract:** Scientific fraud and misconduct appear to be on the rise throughout the scientific community. Whatever the reasons for fraud and whatever the number of cases, it is important that the academic research community consider this problem in a cool and rational manner, ensuring that allegations are dealt with through fair and impartial procedures. Increasingly, governments have either sought to regulate fraud and misconduct through legislation, or they have left it to universities and research institutions to deal with at the local level. The result has been less than uniform understanding of what constitutes scientific fraud and misconduct and a great deal of variance in procedures used to investigate such allegations. In this paper, we propose a standard definition of scientific fraud and misconduct and procedures for investigation based on natural justice and fairness. The issue of fraud and misconduct should not be left to government regulation by default. The standardized definition and procedures presented here should lead to more appropriate institutional responses in dealing with allegations of scientific fraud and misconduct.
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**Abstract:** Under the guidelines adopted by the United States (U.S.) Office of Research Integrity (ORI), scientific misconduct is defined by one or more of three activities: fabrication of data, falsification of results, and plagiarism or the improper appropriation of other people's ideas or written work. This paper discusses whether three other breaches in scientific ethics, namely ghost writing, fabricating credentials, and failure to disclose conflicts of interest, rise to the level of scientific misconduct. After discussing the funding effect in science, the paper argues that, like ghost writing and fabricated credentials, conflicts of interest can bias the outcome of research. Thus, lack of transparency to reviewers, journals and readers for conflicts of interest should be considered a form of scientific misconduct.
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Scientific misconduct, the pharmaceutical industry, and the tragedy of institutions

Abstract: This paper examines how current legislative and regulatory models do not adequately govern the pharmaceutical industry towards ethical scientific conduct. In the context of a highly profit-driven industry, governments need to ensure ethical and legal standards are not only in place for companies but that they are enforceable. We demonstrate with examples from both industrialized and developing countries how without sufficient controls, there is a risk that corporate behaviour will transgress ethical boundaries. We submit that there is a critical need for urgent drug regulatory reform. There must be robust regulatory structures in place which enforce corporate governance mechanisms to ensure that pharmaceutical companies maintain ethical standards in drug research and development and the marketing of pharmaceuticals. What is also needed is for the pharmaceutical industry to adopt authentic "corporate social responsibility" policies as current policies and practices are insufficient.
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The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: secrecy in the pharmaceutical arena

Abstract: Secrecy in the pharmaceutical arena has taken on more importance in the recent past as the pharmaceutical industry has assumed greater prominence in the funding of clinical research and has also become a funder of the agencies that are charged with regulating it. Governments have adopted a neo-liberal agenda that prioritizes private profit over public health and are therefore willing to let industry set the research agenda. As a result, secrecy, to protect intellectual property rights, is a major feature of clinical research. Secrecy also leads to biases in the published literature that conceal significant safety problems. Because regulators are now partially dependent on the pharmaceutical industry for their existence regulators are unwilling to challenge industry. By treating data on efficacy and safety as commercially confidential information they effectively collude with industry in denying health professionals and the public access to essential information to be able to use drugs appropriately.
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Abstract: The increasing globalization of scientific research lends urgency to the need for international agreement on the concepts of scientific misconduct. Universal spiritual and moral principles on which ethical standards are generally based indicate that it is possible to reach international agreement on the ethical principles underlying good scientific practice. Concordance on an operational definition of scientific misconduct that would allow independent observers to agree which behaviour constitutes misconduct is more problematic. Defining scientific misconduct to be universally recognized and universally sanctioned means addressing the broader question of ensuring that research is not only well-designed - and addresses a real need for better evidence - but that it is ethically conducted in different cultures. An instrument is needed to ensure that uneven ethical standards do not create unnecessary obstacles to research, particularly in developing countries.
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Martinson, Brian C.; Anderson, Melissa A.; Crain, A. Lauren; De Vries, Raymond
Scientists' perceptions of organizational justice and self-reported misbehaviors

Abstract: Policymakers concerned about maintaining the integrity of science have recently expanded their attention from a focus on misbehaving individuals to characteristics of the environments in which scientists work. Little empirical evidence exists about the role of organizational justice in promoting or hindering scientific integrity. Our findings indicate that when scientists believe they are being treated unfairly they are more likely to behave in ways that compromise the integrity of science. Perceived violations of distributive and procedural justice were positively associated with self-reports of misbehavior among scientists.
Normal misbehavior: scientists talk about the ethics of research

Abstract: Those concerned with protecting the Integrity of science generally focus on the serious but rare infractions of falsification, fabrication, and plagiarism (FFP). While the violations of FFP are clear threats to the quality of scientific work and public trust in science, are they the behaviors that researchers themselves find most troubling? Noticing that scientists seldom are asked to report their perceptions of the behaviors that pose problems for the enterprise of science, we conducted six focus groups with researchers from major research universities. A total of 51 scientists participated in our focus-group discussions, which lasted from 1.5 to 2 hours each. We found that while researchers were aware of the problems of FFP, in their eyes misconduct generally is associated with more mundane, everyday problems in the work environment. These more common problems fall into four categories: the meaning of data, the rules of science, life with colleagues, and the pressures of production in science. Focus on the "normal misbehaviors" that are part of the ordinary life of researchers allows us to see the way the organization of science generates both compliance and deviance from ethical norms.
Document 791
Guterman, Lila
The taint of 'misbehavior'
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
http://chronicle.com (link may be outdated)

Document 792
Ellison, Sarah
Scientist presses claim P&G misrepresented Actonel data
http://www.wsj.com (link may be outdated)

Document 793
Shamoo, Adil E.
Data audit would reduce unethical behaviour [letttter]
Nature 2006 February 16; 439(7078): 784
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
http://www.nature.com (link may be outdated)

Document 794
Hamblin, Terry
The secret life of Dr. Chandram [review]
BMJ: British Medical Journal 2006 February 11; 332(7537): 369
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
http://www.bmj.com (link may be outdated)

Document 795
University of Pittsburgh
Summary Investigative Report on Allegations of Possible Scientific Misconduct on the Part of Gerald P. Schatten, Ph.D., February 8, 2006
Abstract: This report was written by a University of Pittsburgh panel established to investigate the role of its professor Gerald P. Schatten, Ph.D., Professor of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences and Director, Pittsburgh Development Center, in the collaboration with Korean scientist Woo-Suk Hwang, who falsified data concerning derivation of stem cells from cloned human embryos. Dr. Schatten was co-corresponding and senior author on the Science paper. [KIE]
http://newsbureau.upmc.com/PDF/Final%20Public%20Report%202.08.pdf (link may be outdated)
* Document 796

Cho, Mildred K.; McGee, Glenn; Magnus, David

**Lessons of the stem cell scandal**

Science 2006 February 3; 311(5761): 614-615

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](http://www.sciencemag.org) for access to full text

* Document 797

Vogeli, Christine; Yucel, Recai; Bendavid, Eran; Jones, Lisa M.; Anderson, Melissa S.; Louis, Karen Seashore; Campbell, Eric G.

**Data withholding and the next generation of scientists: results of a national survey**

Academic Medicine 2006 February; 81(2): 128-136

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](http://www.sciencemag.org) for access to full text

* Document 798

**A final notice of debarment**

Human Research Report 2006 February; 21(2): 11

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](http://www.sciencemag.org) for access to full text

* Document 799

**A finding of research misconduct**

Human Research Report 2006 February; 21(2): 11

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](http://www.sciencemag.org) for access to full text

* Document 800

**A finding of research misconduct**

Human Research Report 2006 February; 21(2): 11

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](http://www.sciencemag.org) for access to full text

* Document 801

American Society of Clinical Oncology [ASCO]

**Revisions of and clarifications to the ASCO conflict of interest policy**

Journal of Clinical Oncology 2006 January 20; 24(3): 517-518

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](http://www.sciencemag.org) for access to full text

* Document 802
American Society Of Clinical Oncology: revised conflict of interest policy
Journal of Clinical Oncology 2006 January 20; 24(3): 519-521

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 803
Fuyuno, Ichiko
Hwang scandal hits Korean biotech hard
Nature 2006 January 19; 439(7074): 265

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

http://www.nature.com (link may be outdated)

Document 804
Schroter, Sara; Tite, Leanne; Hutchings, Andrew; Black, Nick
Differences in review quality and recommendations for publication between peer reviewers suggested by authors or by editors

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

http://jama.ama-assn.org (link may be outdated)

Document 805
Weiss, Rick
Deception by researchers relatively rare: but the few scientists who falsify data are difficult to police, experts say

http://www.washingtonpost.com (link may be outdated)

Document 806
Fisher, Celia B.
Clinical trials results databases: unanswered questions
Science 2006 January 13; 311(5758): 180-181

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

http://www.sciencemag.org (link may be outdated)

Document 807
Shaywitz, David A.
Stem cell hype and hope (opinion)
Washington Post 2006 January 12; p. A21
Barely a drop of fraud: why it shouldn't taint our view of science
Kevles, Bettyann Holtzmann
Washington Post 2006 January 8; p. B3

Unhealthy medicine: all breakthrough, no follow-through (opinion)
Woolf, Steven H.
Washington Post 2006 January 8; p. B3

A nation's pride turns to shame
Brender, Alan

Superfluous medical studies called into question
Brown, David
Washington Post 2006 January 2; p. A6

Conference summary: 'The Responsible Conduct of Basic and Clinical Research'
Spier, Raymond E.
Science and Engineering Ethics 2006 January; 12(1): 189-197

The Poehlman case: running away from the truth
Dahlberg, John E.; Mahler, Christian C.
**Document 814**

Gefenas, Eugenijus

The concept of risk and responsible conduct of research

Science and Engineering Ethics 2006 January; 12(1): 75-83

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

---

**Document 815**

Steneck, Nicholas H.

Fostering integrity in research: definitions, current knowledge, and future directions


Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

---

**Document 816**

Farthing, Michael J.G.

Authors and publication practices


Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

---

**Document 817**

Pascal, Chris B.

Managing data for integrity: policies and procedures for ensuring the accuracy and quality of the data in the laboratory


Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

---

**Document 818**

Drenth, Pieter J.D.

Responsible conduct in research


Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

---

**Document 819**

Wachbroit, Robert

Research as a profession


Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text
Document 820
Verma, K.K.
Scams in science
Eubios Journal of Asian and International Bioethics 2006 January; 16(1): 3-4
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
http://www.unescobkk.org/index.php?id=2434 (link may be outdated)

Document 821
Brandt, Allan; Mooney, Chris; Wood, Susan; Brock, Dan
The politicization of science
Medical Ethics Newsletter [Lahey Clinic] 2006 Winter; 13(1): 5-8
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
http://www.lahey.org/Ethics/ (link may be outdated)

Document 822
Kjeldsen, Sverre E.; Narkiewicz, Krzysztof; Cifkova, Renata; Mancia, Giuseppe
ESH statement on detection and punishment of abstract fraud and poster plagiarism
Journal of Hypertension 2006 January; 24(1): 203-204
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 823
VEA (Video Education America)
Abstract: "This program focuses on Niels Bohr, who worked with some of the best physicists of the 20th century to devise his atomic model. Students will gain an understanding of the historical developments in atomic theories up to Bohr, a brief outline of Bohr's life, Bohr's first and second postulates and his influence on contemporary society. Featuring unique animation, plain English and frequent summarizing, students will gain a comprehensive understanding of the history and and the theory of Bohr's Atomic Model." [description from dvd cover]

www.veavideo.com (link may be outdated)

Document 824
Atkinson, John and Crowe, Malcolm, eds.
INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH: DIVERSE APPROACHES IN SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, HEALTH, AND SOCIETY
Call number: RA418 .I58 2006

Document 825
Israel, Mark and Hay, Iain
* Document 826
Adrian, Manuella

**Decisions involving research and ethics: misusing drug use(r) statistics**
In: Kleinig, John; Einstein, Stanley, eds. Ethical Challenges for Intervening in Drug Use: Policy, Research and Treatment Issues. Huntsville, TX: Office of International Criminal Justice: Sam Houston State University, Criminal Justice Center, 2006: 217-258
Call number: HV4998.E74 2006

* Document 827
Kulakowski, Elliott C.

**Dealing with allegations of research misconduct: the other side of responsible conduct of research**
In: Kulakowski, Elliott C.; Chronister, Lynne U., eds. Research Administration and Management. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett, 2006: 617-624
Call number: Q180.U5 R3816 2006

* Document 828
Pascal, Chris B.

**Beyond the federal definition: other forms of misconduct**
In: Kulakowski, Elliott C.; Chronister, Lynne U., eds. Research Administration and Management. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett, 2006: 523-530
Call number: Q180.U5 R3816 2006

* Document 829
Chinn, John; Kulakowski, Elliott C.

**Conflict of interest in research**
In: Kulakowski, Elliott C.; Chronister, Lynne U., eds. Research Administration and Management. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett, 2006: 511-521
Call number: Q180.U5 R3816 2006

* Document 830
Krimsky, Sheldon

**Publication bias, data ownership, and the funding effect in science: threats to the integrity of biomedical research**
Call number: Q125.R4178 2006

* Document 831
Sterba, Sonya K.

**Misconduct in the analysis and reporting of data: bridging methodological and ethical agendas for change**
Ethics and Behavior 2006; 16(4): 305-318
Document 832
Roberts, Laura Weiss; McAuliffe, Timothy L.
Investigators’ affirmation of ethical, safeguard, and scientific commitments in human research
Ethics and Behavior 2006; 16(2): 135-150

Document 833
Budinger, Thomas F.; Budinger, Miriam D.
Ethics of scientific research
Call number: T14 .B784 2006

Document 834
Cola, Philip A.; Cottington, Eric M.
Responsible conduct of research.
Call number: R853 .C55 R47 2006

Document 835
Downie, Jocelyn
Grasping the nettle: confronting the issue of competing interests and obligations in health research policy
Call number: KE3404 .J87 2006

Document 836
Lemmens, Trudo
Commercialized medical research and the need for regulatory reform
Call number: KE3404 .J87 2006

Document 837
Brown, James Robert
Self-censorship
In: Lemmens, Trudo; Waring, Duff R., eds. Law and Ethics in Biomedical Research: Regulation, Conflict of Interest and Liability. Toronto; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 2006: 82-94
Call number: KE3663 .M38 L39 2006
Krimsky, Sheldon
The ethical and legal foundations of scientific 'conflict of interest'
In: Lemmens, Trudo; Waring, Duff R., eds. Law and Ethics in Biomedical Research: Regulation, Conflict of Interest and Liability. Toronto; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 2006: 63-81
Call number: KE3663.M38 L39 2006

* Article Document 839
Ness, April C.
National Institutes of Health enacts final ethics regulations
Journal of Biolaw and Business 2006; 9(1): 50-51
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

* Article Document 840
Liang, Bryan A.
The bounds of science and ethics
Journal of Biolaw and Business 2006; 9(1): 44-45
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

* Article Document 841
Meyer, Gitte
Journalism and science: how to erode the idea of knowledge
Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics 2006; 19(3): 239-252
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

* News Document 842
Mathews, Anna Wilde; Wonacott, Peter
At medical journal, editor finds truth hard to track down
Wall Street Journal 2005 December 27; A1, A2
http://www.wsj.com (link may be outdated)

* News Document 843
Mathews, Anna Wilde; Wonacott, Peter
Playing detective: at medical journal, editor finds truth hard to track down; termite-eaten data plague Dr. Smith’s 12-year probe of an Indian researcher; pestering a busy statistician
Wall Street Journal 2005 December 27; p. A1, A2
http://www.wsj.com (link may be outdated)

* News Document 844
Stein, Rob
Ethics in research debated; stem cell debacle spurs calls for improved oversight
Washington Post 2005 December 25; p. A4
http://www.washingtonpost.com (link may be outdated)

Weiss, Rick
Stem cell fraud worries U.S. scientists
http://www.washingtonpost.com (link may be outdated)

Spotts, Peter N.
Laboratory ethics: what makes some scientists cheat?
Christian Science Monitor 2005 December 22; 98(20): 2
http://www.csmonitor.com/ (link may be outdated)

Coffin, Brent
Building ethical capacity for collaborative research
Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 2005 December; 34(4): 531-539
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Anderson, Rebecca
The singular moral compass of Otto Krayer
Molecular Interventions 2005 December; 5(6): 324-329
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Tong, S.; Olsen, J.
The threat to scientific integrity in environmental and occupational medicine
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
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Ties that bind: multiple relationships between clinical researchers and the pharmaceutical industry

BACKGROUND: It is believed that pharmaceutical industry sponsorship of clinical research leads to the development of multiple ties between clinicians and the pharmaceutical industry. To quantify this relationship we conducted a survey of medical specialists listed in the Medical Directory of Australia in 2002 and 2003. METHODS: A questionnaire was mailed that elicited information about all aspects of research relationships between clinicians and pharmaceutical companies. The odds of reporting multiple additional ties (financial and professional) with pharmaceutical companies by clinicians who had an active research relationship were compared with those who did not. All clinicians who returned a completed questionnaire about their research activities were included in the study. RESULTS: A questionnaire was mailed to 2120 medical specialists; 823 (39%) responded. Of these, 338 (41%) reported involvement in industry-sponsored research in the previous year. They were more likely than others to have been offered industry-sponsored items or activities valued at more than 500 AU dollars (>382 US dollars; odds ratio [OR], 3.5; 95% confidence interval [CI], 2.6-4.7) and support for attending international conferences (OR, 5.4; 95% CI, 3.9-7.4). The strongest associations were seen for acting as a paid consultant to industry (OR, 9.0; 95% CI, 3.9-20.4) and for membership on advisory boards (OR, 6.9; 95% CI, 5.1-9.6). There was a strong relationship between research collaboration and accumulation of industry ties. For 1 additional tie the OR was 2.2 (95% CI, 1.2-3.8) and rose to 6.3 (95% CI, 3.5-11.1) with 3 ties and 41.8 (95% CI, 14.5-143.4) with 6 or more ties. CONCLUSIONS: Medical specialists who have research relationships with the pharmaceutical industry are much more likely to have multiple additional ties than those who do not have research relationships. Institutional review should discourage clinical researchers from developing multiple ties.
Pandemic skeptics warn against crying wolf
Science 2005 November 19; 310(5751): 1112-1113
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Abstract: Purpose: The overall purposes of this article are to report the development of a survey instrument, Scientific Misconduct Questionnaire-Revised (SMQ-R) that elicits the perceptions of research coordinators managing clinical trials about the various aspects of scientific misconduct and to present psychometric analyses for the SMQ-R. Methods: A panel of five researchers and research coordinators reviewed the original SMQ (Rankin and Esteeves, 1997) and suggested an additional 42 items based on the review of the literature and their own experiences in research. The SMQ-Revised (SMQ-R) consists of 68 closed-choice items in six sections and one section with 12 open-ended questions. The SMQ-R was sent to 5302 persons who were members of the Association for Clinical Research Professionals (ACRP) or subscribers to Research Practitioner, published by the Center for Clinical Research Practice (CCRP). Findings: Internal consistency of subscales was assessed with Cronbach's alpha and ranged from .83 to .84. Confirmatory factor analysis was used to test construct validity of the instrument subscales. The factor structure was assessed with the principal factors method, using the squared multiple correlations as initial communality estimates followed by varimax (orthogonal) or biquartimax (oblique) rotations. Analyses revealed five distinct factors among three subscales. Construct validity for the SMQ-R was also assessed by testing hypothesized relationships using the known groups approach. Conclusion: The current effort demonstrated the usefulness of the SMQ-R in obtaining information from a national sample of experienced research coordinators about their perceptions of the prevalence of different types of scientific misconduct and of factors that influence the occurrence of misconduct. The psychometric evaluation of the SMQ-R suggests good internal consistency for most subscales and suggests adequate construct validity of the instrument as a whole. The analyses also suggest that further refinement of the instrument for future studies is warranted.
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The scientific misconduct questionnaire -- revised (SMQ-R): validation and psychometric testing
Accountability in Research 2005 October-December; 12(4): 263-280

Abstract: OBJECTIVES: To assess the knowledge and behaviour of researchers regarding criteria for authorship, and the practices of ghost and gift authorship. DESIGN: Semidirective interviews of senior clinical researchers. SETTING: University hospital. PARTICIPANTS: Thirty-nine main investigators of clinical research programmes. Main measurements: Awareness and use of International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) criteria for authorship, and perceptions about ghost and gift authorship. RESULTS: A total of 48 protocols submitted by 42 principal investigators between 1994 and 1996 were identified. Thirty-nine investigators were contacted; 37 (one of whom delegated a co-author) were interviewed between May 2002 and March 2003. Two co-authors of two principal investigators were also interviewed. In all, 42 studies were represented. The interviews lasted for 40-90 minutes and were conducted with openness and respect for confidentiality. The choice of names of co-authors did not follow the ICMJE recommendations. Half of the respondents stated they were aware of criteria for authorship and knew of ICMJE, but most of them did not cite any of the ICMJE criteria among those they applied in deciding authorship. Most of them disagreed with the obligation to meet the three criteria justifying co-authorship because they found
these too rigid and inapplicable. Gift authorship was a common practice; 59% of the respondents had been a recipient of gift authorship. Twenty-five (64%) were aware of ghost authorship and the majority considered it questionable and blameworthy. CONCLUSIONS: The ICMJE criteria were ignored by clinicians at a university hospital. Ghost and gift authorship were frequent among them. There is a need for French guidelines for authorship to be prepared and implemented.
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**Abstract:** The issue of how to best minimize scientific misconduct remains a controversial topic among bioethicists, professors, policymakers, and attorneys. This paper suggests that harsher criminal sanctions against misconduct, better protections for whistleblowers, and the creation of due process standards for misconduct investigations are urgently needed. Although the causes of misconduct and estimates of problem remain varied, the literature suggests that scientific misconduct-fraud, fabrication, and plagiarism of scientific research-continues to damage public health and trust in science. Providing stricter criminal statutes against misconduct is necessary to motivate whistleblowers and deter wrongdoers, and the provision of basic due process protections is necessary for ensuring a fair and balanced misconduct investigation.
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Abstract: OBJECTIVES: To test the application of statistical methods to detect data fabrication in a clinical trial. SETTING: Data from two clinical trials: a trial of a dietary intervention for cardiovascular disease and a trial of a drug intervention for the same problem. OUTCOME MEASURES: Baseline comparisons of means and variances of cardiovascular risk factors; digit preference overall and its pattern by group. RESULTS: In the dietary intervention trial, variances for 16 of the 22 variables available at baseline were significantly different, and 10 significant differences were seen in means for these variables. Some of these P values were extraordinarily small. Distributions of the final recorded digit were significantly different between the intervention and the control group at baseline for 14/22 variables in the dietary trial. In the drug trial, only five variables were available, and no significant differences between the groups for baseline values in means or variances or digit preference were seen. CONCLUSIONS: Several statistical features of the data from the dietary trial are so strongly suggestive of data fabrication that no other explanation is likely.
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](http://www.bmj.com) for access to full text

* Article Document 899
Smith, Richard
Investigating the previous studies of a fraudulent author
BMJ: British Medical Journal 2005 July 30; 331(7511): 288-291
Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](http://www.bmj.com) for access to full text
* Document 900
White, Caroline
Suspected research fraud: difficulties of getting at the truth
BMJ: British Medical Journal 2005 July 30; 331(7511): 281-288
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
http://www.bmj.com (link may be outdated)

* Document 901
Begley, Sharon
Fluoridation, cancer: did researchers ask the right questions?
Wall Street Journal 2005 July 22; p. B1
http://www.wsj.com (link may be outdated)

Document 902
Weiss, Rick
44 violated ethics rules, NIH director tells panel; conflict-of-interest inquiry focused on work done by 103 current and former employees
Washington Post 2005 July 15; p. A21
http://www.washingtonpost.com (link may be outdated)

Document 903
Bhattacharjee, Yudhijit
Follow-up: sharing the blame: delayed payment
Science 2005 July 15; 309(5733): 379
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
http://www.sciencemag.org (link may be outdated)

Document 904
Eilperin, Juliet
Professor at Harvard is being investigated; fluoride-cancer link may have been hidden
http://www.washingtonpost.com (link may be outdated)

Document 905
Martyn, Christopher
The Drug Trial: Nancy Olivieri and the Science Scandal That Rocked the Hospital for Sick Children, by
Miriam Shuchman [book review]
BMJ: British Medical Journal 2005 July 9; 331(7508): 115

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

http://www.bmj.com (link may be outdated)

Document 906

Solomon, John

NIH review substantiates fired expert's concerns
Washington Post 2005 July 4; p. A2

http://www.washingtonpost.com (link may be outdated)

Document 907

Chachra, Debbie

Beyond course-based engineering ethics instruction
Science and Engineering Ethics 2005 July; 11(3): 459-461

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 908

Mushavitch, Karen M.T.

Cases and goals for ethics education [commentary on Connecting Case-based Ethics Instruction with Educational Theory by M.W. Keefer]
Science and Engineering Ethics 2005 July; 11(3): 431-434

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 909

Keefer, Matthew Wilks

Making good use of online case study materials
Science and Engineering Ethics 2005 July; 11(3): 413-429

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 910

Campbell, Betsy

Teaching about good work by preparing well: designing online resources for ethics educators
Science and Engineering Ethics 2005 July; 11(3): 409-411

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 911

Huff, Chuck; Frey, William
Moral pedagogy and practical ethics
Science and Engineering Ethics 2005 July; 11(3): 389-408
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 912
Pritchard, Michael
Teaching research ethics and working together [commentary on Pedagogical Objectives in Teaching Research Ethics in Science and Engineering by B. Schrag]
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 913
Schrag, Brian
Teaching research ethics: can web-based instruction satisfy appropriate pedagogical objectives?
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 914
Bird, Stephanie J.; Sieber, Joan E.
Teaching ethics in science and engineering: effective online education
Science and Engineering Ethics 2005 July; 11(3): 323-328
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 915
Diamond, Bruce
Steve Nissen
Nature Medicine 2005 July; 11(7): 700
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 916
Lefor, Alan T.
Scientific misconduct and unethical human experimentation: historic parallels and moral implications
Nutrition 2005 July-August; 21(7-8): 878-882
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 917
Lind, Rebecca Ann
Evaluating research misconduct policies at major research universities: a pilot study
Accountability in Research 2005 July-September; 12(3): 241-262
Abstract: This pilot study evaluates the accessibility and usefulness of the research misconduct (RM) policies at the
top-25 universities as ranked by NIH and NSF grant awards. Measuring accessibility demonstrates how readily-available policies are to the people they affect. Evaluating the range of policy content indicates whether policies and procedures on research misconduct are "useful" as opposed to merely "minimal" (Rhoades, 2003). On average, it took five clicks to get from a university's home page to its RM policies. Only nine policies were accessed within three or fewer clicks. Policy information was coded into categories comprising a total of 20 topic areas, which were then grouped into five content domains. The policies reveal a broad range of usefulness. Some provide relevant details on almost every topic area, while others leave most questions unanswered. Three of the 20 topic areas are almost universally covered in the policies analyzed. In contrast, five other topic areas average less than half of the information which could have been included. These policies, from elite U.S. research universities, may serve as role models; as such they should perhaps be held to the highest standards. If the message sent by a policy lacks clarity and precision, it should be revised to include an appropriate level of detail.

* Document 918
Adams, Douglas; Pimple, Kenneth D.
Research misconduct and crime lessons from criminal science on preventing misconduct and promoting integrity
Accountability in Research 2005 July-September; 12(3): 225- 240
Abstract: For 200 years, criminologists theorized that delinquent and criminal acts arise from deviant psychological states (such as irrationality or immorality) and/or social conditions that produce these psychological states. This theoretical perspective, which is being duplicated in most efforts to understand and control research misconduct, has not been productive. More recently, criminological perspectives have emerged, emphasizing situational factors that enhance or restrict the opportunity for illegal or imprudent behavior. These so-called "opportunity" theories have been shown to have practical value in reducing crime rates. We explore the promise of these newer theories for the responsible conduct of research (RCR).

* Document 919
Heitman, Elizabeth; Bulger, Ruth Ellen
Assessing the educational literature in the responsible conduct of research for core content
Accountability in Research 2005 July-September; 12(3): 207- 224
Abstract: To determine core content for RCR instruction, content analysis was conducted using key instructional resources for ORI's nine RCR "core instructional areas". Topics discussed in these key RCR resources were identified and their frequency across resources was tabulated. Topics covered most frequently were judged to be core content. Although key educational resources cited a variety of references, specific topics and issues addressed were generally consistent across the materials examined. Nonetheless, key resources varied in organization and depth of coverage for core instructional areas. Recent resources were more systematic and comprehensive than earlier works. This was particularly evident in materials about human participant research, conflicts of interest, and data management and sharing. Key resources presented additional "non-core" issues, such as scientific values, epidemiological issues, and scientists' societal roles, suggesting that ORI's core instructional areas should be reconfigured or expanded. Because educational material available on RCR and professionalism was so comprehensive, we recommend that ORI consider research integrity, not research misconduct, as one core instructional area. We also recommend that compliance with research regulations be restored as a core instructional area to accentuate ethical, financial and legal requirements related to acceptance of federal funding.

* Document 920
Barrett, Kirsten A.; Funk, Carolyn L.; Macrina, Francis L.
Awareness of publication guidelines and the responsible conduct of research
Accountability in Research 2005 July-September; 12(3): 193- 206
Abstract: We have conducted a longitudinal survey of NIH-funded F32 postdoctoral fellows to determine if mandated instruction in the responsible conduct of research (RCR) has measurable effects on awareness of, attentiveness to, and behavioral judgments about research ethics and authorship and publication. Of 418 F32 fellows participating in the study, 50% were aware of and had referred to guidelines on authorship and publication practices while 50% were either unaware of or had not referred to guidelines. Groups were similar with regard to total number of peer-reviewed publications and total number of first author publications, years of research experience, years since completing their doctoral degree, and receipt of RCR training. The equal distribution of guideline awareness and use, and group similarities with regard to career development and achievement provided us with an opportunity to consider whether awareness of and use of guidelines is associated with broader judgments about author roles and responsibilities. The findings suggest that awareness and utilization of guidelines are, at best, only modestly associated with more ethically appropriate judgments and attitudes about author roles and responsibilities among novice F32's.

* Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

Document 921

Mello, Michelle M.; Claridge, Brian R.; Studdert, David M.

Researchers' views of the acceptability of restrictive provisions in clinical trial agreements with industry sponsors

Accountability in Research 2005 July-September; 12(3): 163-191

Abstract: We conducted a mail survey of 884 U.S. medical school faculty active in clinical research to elicit their views about the acceptability of provisions in contracts for industry-sponsored clinical trials that would restrict investigators' academic freedom and control over trials. We compared their responses to results from a similar survey of research administrators at 107 medical schools. There was substantial variation among clinical researchers in their acceptability judgments, with a relatively large proportion of clinical trial investigators willing to accept provisions that give industry sponsors considerable control over the dissemination of research results. There were significant differences in the perceptions of clinical trial investigators versus other recently published clinical researchers; investigators with a high versus low percentage of research support from industry; junior versus senior faculty; and investigators at institutions with high versus low National Institute of Health (NIH) funding ranks. There was also a significant divergence of views in a number of areas between clinical trialists and research administrators who negotiate clinical trial contracts on their behalf. Medical school faculty could benefit from additional guidance about what their institution views as acceptable parameters for industry-sponsored clinical trial agreements.

* Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

Document 922

Maloney, Dennis M.

Office of Research Integrity


Both accused researchers and whistle-blowers stay anonymous when no misconduct is found

Human Research Report 2005 July; 20(7): 8

* Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

Document 923

Maloney, Dennis M.

United States. Department of Energy

Policy on research misconduct
* **Document 925**

United States. Department of Health and Human Services [HHS]. Office of Research Integrity

**Final rule on research misconduct: frequently asked questions and answers**


http://ori.dhhs.gov/policies/faq.shtml (link may be outdated)

* **Document 926**

Martinson, Brian C.; Anderson, Melissa S.; de Vries, Raymond

**Scientists behaving badly**

Nature 2005 June 9; 435(7043): 737-738

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

http://www.nature.com (link may be outdated)

* **Document 927**

Weiss, Rick

**Many scientists admit to misconduct: degrees of deception vary in poll; researchers say findings could hurt the field**


http://www.washingtonpost.com (link may be outdated)

* **Document 928**


**Medical specialists and pharmaceutical industry-sponsored research: a survey of the Australian experience**


Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

* **Document 929**

Bero, Lisa A.

**Managing financial conflicts of interest in research**

Journal of the American College of Dentists 2005 Summer; 72(2): 4-9

http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/01jan20051800/edocket.access.gpo.gov/2005/pdf/05-12645.pdf (link may be outdated)
* Document 930

Lavelle, Sylvain

**Science, technology and ethics: from critical perspective to dialectical perspective**

Ethical Theory and Moral Practice 2005 June; 8(3): 217-238

* Document 931

Redman, Barbara K.; Caplan, Arthur L.

**Off with their heads: the need to criminalize some forms of scientific misconduct**

Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics 2005 Summer; 33(2): 345-348

**Abstract:** Improvement in policy for the management of scientific misconduct has been slow. While assurance of due process at the ORI level is now in place, similar protections at the institutional level and institutional responsibility for further oversight and a workplace where the responsible conduct of research can be practiced have not yet been addressed. In contrast, policy regarding human subject protection has evolved rapidly to reflect firmer norms, with decisive priority given to subject protection over scientific or social needs. Perhaps because scientific misconduct policy has the potential to harm the careers of individual scientists and harms to individual subjects are thought to be indirect, the scientific community has been successful in blocking every move toward testing more rigorous regulation. The mantras that scientists can discipline their own, and the price of competitive science is some level of scientific misconduct are not persuasive. The standards by which science is judged should not be an exception to those governing others who deal with the public's money and have a duty to the public interest.

* Document 932

Al-Marzouki, Sanaa; Roberts, Ian; Marshall, Tom; Evans, Stephen

**The effect of scientific misconduct on the results of clinical trials: a Delphi survey**

Contemporary Clinical Trials 2005 June; 26(3): 331-337

* Document 933

Jones, James W.; McCullough, Laurence B.; Richman, Bruce W.

**The ethics of odd ideas, good science, and academic freedom**


* Document 934

Akabayashi, Akira; Slingsby, Brian Taylor; Takimoto, Yoshiyuki

**Conflict of interest: a Japanese perspective**

CQ: Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics 2005 Summer; 14(3): 277-280
Document 935
Maloney, Dennis M.
Researchers’ right to privacy in misconduct investigations
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 936
Smalheiser, Neil R.; Perkins, Guy A; Jones, Steve
Guidelines for negotiating scientific collaboration
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
http://www.plosbiology.org (link may be outdated)

Document 937
DeRenzo, Evan G.
Conflict-of-interest policy at the National Institutes of Health: the pendulum swings wildly
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 938
Zimmerman, Rachel; Tomsho, Robert
Medical editor turns activist on drug trials
Wall Street Journal 2005 May 26; p. B1, B5
http://www.wsj.com (link may be outdated)

Document 939
Giles, Jim
Taking on the cheats
Nature 2005 May 19; 435(7040): 258-259
Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
http://www.nature.com (link may be outdated)

Document 940
United States. Department of Health and Human Services
Public Health Service policies on research misconduct; final rule
Wren, Jonathan D.  
**Open access and openly accessible: a study of scientific publications shared via the internet**  

Kondro, Wayne  
**Université de Montréal in the dark about fraud**  
CMAJ/JAMC: Canadian Medical Association Journal 2005 May 10; 172(10): 1278

Rosner, David; Markowitz, Gerald; Needleman, Herbert  
**Standing up to the lead industry: an interview with Herbert Needleman**  
Public Health Reports 2005 May-June; 120(3): 330-337

Maloney, Dennis M.  
**Privacy of researchers versus public's right to know their names**  
Human Research Report 2005 May; 20(5): 8

Maloney, Dennis M.  
**Researcher's misconduct leads to criminal charges**  

Wagena, Edwin J.  
**The scandal of unfair behaviour of senior faculty**
Financial liaisons between clinical researchers, research institutions, and industrial sponsors have gained momentum in recent years. In the process, it has been argued by many that trust in the research infrastructure is being eroded by the financial conflicts of interest that emerge from these arrangements. Yet, the financial resources of industry are needed to continue technology transfer from the bench to the bedside. Policy makers and government regulators are currently struggling to determine how to best manage financial conflicts of interest that emerge from these liaisons. Various organizations and government entities have proposed different strategies. This paper explores the limitations of existing measures and recommends that a unified national agenda is needed. We propose...
10 steps to develop an agenda to address financial conflicts of interest in industry-sponsored clinical research.
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* Maloney, Dennis M.

**Researcher wins the battle but loses the war**

*Human Research Report* 2005 April; 20(4): 8
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Document 954

* Kintisch, Eli

**Researcher faces prison for fraud in NIH grant applications and papers**

*Science* 2005 March 25; 307(5717): 1851
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* Department of Health and Human Services [DHHS]

**Findings of scientific misconduct**
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Document 956

* Brainard, Jeffrey

**NIH consultant finds little evidence of bias against clinical researchers**

*Chronicle of Higher Education* 2005 March 18; 51(28): A23
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Document 957
Department of Health and Human Services [DHHS]

Findings of scientific misconduct

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

http://grants2.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-05-037.html (link may be outdated)

Document 958
Jacobson, Jennifer
Stem-cell institute challenged in Calif.
Chronicle of Higher Education 2005 March 11; 51(27): A25

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

http://chronicle.com (link may be outdated)

Document 959
Fox, Jeffrey L.
Biotech consulting, investing by NIH scientists curbed
Nature Biotechnology 2005 March; 23(3): 274

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 960
Burgin, Eileen
Dollars, disease, and democracy: has the Director's Council of Public Representatives improved the National Institutes of Health?

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

http://www.politicsandthelifesciences.org/ (link may be outdated)

Document 961
Freudenburg, William R.
Seeding science, courting conclusions: reexamining the intersection of science, corporate cash, and the law

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text

Document 962
Bedward, Julie; Davison, Ian; Field, Stephen; Thomas, Hywel
Audit, educational development and research: what counts for ethics and research governance?
Medical Teacher 2005 March; 27(2): 99-101

Georgetown users check Georgetown Journal Finder for access to full text
Developing an educational curriculum in primary care with practitioner and manager involvement: the governance shackle

Bastable, Ruth; Bateman, Hilarie; Hibble, Arthur; Wells, Christina

Medical Teacher 2005 March; 27(2): 127-129

Conflicts of interest/commitment

Michalek, Arthur M.; Wicher, Camille C.

Journal of Cancer Education 2005 Spring; 20(1): 8-9

Secrecy in medical journals

Hammerschmidt, Dale E.; Franklin, Michael

Minnesota Medicine 2005 March; 88(3): 34-35

Tobacco industry manipulation of research

Bero, Lisa A.

Public Health Reports 2005 March-April; 120(2): 200-208

Changing conclusions on secondhand smoke in a sudden infant death syndrome review funded by the tobacco industry

Tong, Elisa K.; England, Lucinda; Glantz, Stanton A.


The curious saga of Congress, the NIH, and conflict of interest

Crigger, Bette-Jane

Hastings Center Report 2005 March-April; 35(2): 13-14
Module six: special issues

Abstract: The objective of this module is to cover ground that was not covered in-depth in any of the other modules, including: scientific misconduct, issues concerning the publication and ownership of research results (authorship guidelines - who is eligible to be considered an author, or contributor to a scientific paper etc.), special problems occurring in social science and epidemiological research, and the problems pertaining to conflicts of interest the various players in biomedical research activities could encounter.
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Maloney, Dennis M.
Researcher should have revealed potential conflicts of interest in his grant applications
Human Research Report 2005 March; 20(3): 8
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Maloney, Dennis M.
Agency wants faster public access to research results
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Greenberg, Daniel S.
Scandals and safeguards: is scientific fraud on the increase? [review of The Great Betrayal: Fraud in Science, by Horace Freeland Judson]
Nature 2005 February 24; 433(7028): 801-802
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Weiss, Rick
NIH clears most researchers in conflict-of-interest probe
Washington Post 2005 February 23; p. A1, A4

http://www.washingtonpost.com (link may be outdated)

Doumbo, Ogobara K.
It takes a village: medical research and ethics in Mali
Science 2005 February 4; 307(5710): 679-681
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Rosenwald, Michael S.

Biotech industry sees potential in ethics rules
Washington Post 2005 February 3; p. E1, E5

http://www.washingtonpost.com (link may be outdated)
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*  Document 976
Weiss, Rick
NIH will restrict outside income: tighter rules address concerns about conflicts of interest
Washington Post 2005 February 2; p. A1, A7
http://www.washingtonpost.com (link may be outdated)

*  Document 977
National Institutes of Health [NIH] (United States)
Bethesda, MD: National Institutes of Health, 2005 February 1; 3 p. [Online]. Available:
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*  Document 979
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Discussing "the limits of scientific research" [opinion]
Neurological Sciences 2005 February; 25(6): 305-306
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Ninth General Assembly of the Pontifical Academy of Life
Concluding communique on the "ethics of biomedical research for a Christian vision" (26 February 2003)
Linacre Quarterly 2005 February; 72(1): 74-78
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Maloney, Dennis M.
Researcher's claims that grant instructions on possible conflicts of interest were unclear

Document 982
Haigh, Carol; Jones, Neil A.
An overview of the ethics of cyber-space research and the implication for nurse educators
Nurse Education Today 2005 January; 25(1): 3-8

Document 983
Rubin, Eugene H.
The complexities of individual financial conflicts of interest
Neuropsychopharmacology 2005 January; 30(1): 1-6

Document 984
Claxton, Larry D.
Scientific authorship. Part 1. A window into scientific fraud?
Mutation Research 2005 January; 589(1): 17-30

Document 985
Claxton, Larry D.
Scientific authorship. Part 2. History, recurring issues, practices, and guidelines
Mutation Research 2005 January; 589(1): 31-45
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Research environments that promote integrity
Nursing Research 2005 January-February; 54(1): 63-70
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Maloney, Dennis M.
Protecting against financial conflict of interest at the NIH
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The ethical limits of science
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Document 995

Bryant, John; Baggott la Velle, Linda; Searle, John

A code of ethics for biologists?
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Document 996

Veatch, Robert M.

The roles of scientific and normative expertise in public policy formation: the anthrax vaccine case
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Document 997

Bradley, S. Gaylen

Managing competing interests.
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Document 998

Clarke, Mickey; McCartney, Denise A.; Siegel, Barry A.

Regulatory oversight.


Call number: R850.T73 2005
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Nagell, Hilde W.

A penny for your thoughts -- ethics in sponsored research


Call number: BJ1581.2.E85 2005 v.1
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**Misconduct in science**


Call number: Q175.35 .E53 2005 v.3

**Document 1008**

Davis, Michael

**Conflict of interest**
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Shamoo, Adil E.

**Accountability in research**


Call number: Q175.35 .E53 2005 v.1

**Document 1010**
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**ESH statement on detection and punishment of abstract fraud and poster plagiarism**
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**Biomedicine and moral agency in a complex world.**
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Steinberg, David

**A Porsche for patient accrual**

Cancer Investigation 2005; 23(8): 741-743
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**Conflicts of interest in medical research: how much conflict should exceed legal boundaries?**
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**Commentary: an independent voice?: Conflicts of interest and research on ethical, legal and social issues**
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**Protection denied in NIH dismissal**

*Washington Post* 2004 December 29; p. A17
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**Studies on painkillers in jeopardy: researchers assess risk-benefit ratio**

*Washington Post* 2004 December 26; p. A1, A10

[http://www.washingtonpost.com](http://www.washingtonpost.com) (link may be outdated)
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**Research flawed on key AIDS medicine: Bush had planned its use in Africa**

*Washington Post* 2004 December 14; p. A14

[http://www.washingtonpost.com](http://www.washingtonpost.com) (link may be outdated)
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Smith, Anthony J.

**Scientific freedom**

*Journal of Dental Research* 2004 December; 83(12): 895
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**Consumer involvement in decisions about what health-related research is funded**
Health Policy 2004 December; 70(3): 281-290
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Maloney, Dennis M.

**Grand proposal reviewer says he would have scored proposal lower due to conflict of interest**
Human Research Report 2004 December; 19(12): 8

Georgetown users check [Georgetown Journal Finder](#) for access to full text

---

Document 1021
Maloney, Dennis M.

**A researcher keeps her IRB in the dark**
Human Research Report 2004 December; 19(12): 4
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Partridge, Nick; Scadding, John

**The James Lind Alliance: patients and clinicians should jointly identify their priorities for clinical trials [opinion]**
Lancet 2004 November 27-December 3; 364(9449): 1923-1924
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**Abstract**: CONTEXT: Selective reporting of outcomes within published studies based on the nature or direction of their results has been widely suspected, but direct evidence of such bias is currently limited to case reports.
OBJECTIVE: To study empirically the extent and nature of outcome reporting bias in a cohort of randomized trials. DESIGN: Cohort study using protocols and published reports of randomized trials approved by the Scientific-Ethical Committees for Copenhagen and Frederiksberg, Denmark, in 1994-1995. The number and characteristics of reported and unreported trial outcomes were recorded from protocols, journal articles, and a survey of trialists. An outcome was considered incompletely reported if insufficient data were presented in the published articles for meta-analysis. Odds ratios relating the completeness of outcome reporting to statistical significance were calculated for each trial and then pooled to provide an overall estimate of bias. Protocols and published articles were also compared to identify discrepancies in primary outcomes. MAIN OUTCOME MEASURES: Completeness of reporting of efficacy and harm outcomes and of statistically significant vs nonsignificant outcomes; consistency between primary outcomes defined in the most recent protocols and those defined in published articles. RESULTS: One hundred two trials with 122 published journal articles and 3736 outcomes were identified. Overall, 50% of efficacy and 65% of harm outcomes per trial were incompletely reported. Statistically significant outcomes had a higher odds of being fully reported compared with nonsignificant outcomes for both efficacy (pooled odds ratio, 2.4; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.4-4.0) and harm (pooled odds ratio, 4.7; 95% CI, 1.8-12.0) data. In comparing published articles with protocols, 62% of trials had at least 1 primary outcome that was changed, introduced, or omitted. Eighty-six percent of survey responders (42/49) denied the existence of unreported outcomes despite clear evidence to the contrary. CONCLUSIONS: The reporting of trial outcomes is not only frequently incomplete but also biased and inconsistent with protocols. Published articles, as well as reviews that incorporate them, may therefore be unreliable and overestimate the benefits of an intervention. To ensure transparency, planned trials should be registered and protocols should be made publicly available prior to trial completion.
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Abstract: According to some estimates, less than 10% of the world's biomedical research funds are dedicated to addressing problems that are responsible for 90% of the world's burden of disease. This paper explains why this disparity exists and what should be done about it. It argues that the disparity exists because: 1) multinational pharmaceutical and biotechnology companies do not regard research and development investments on the health problems of developing nations to be economically lucrative; and 2) governmental agencies that sponsor biomedical research face little political pressure to allocate funds for the problems of developing nations. This paper argues that developed nations have an obligation to address disparities related to biomedical research funding. To facilitate this effort, developed countries should establish a trust fund dedicated to research on the health problems of developing nations similar to the Global AIDS Fund.
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**The Olivieri debacle: where were the heroes of bioethics?**  
Journal of Medical Ethics 2004 February; 30(1): 44-49  

**Abstract:** All Canadian bioethicists need to reflect on the meaning and value of their work, to see more clearly how the ethics of bioethics is being undermined from within. In the case involving Dr. Olivieri, the Hospital for Sick Children, the University of Toronto, and Apotex Inc., there were countless opportunities for bioethical heroism. And yet, no bioethics heroes emerged from this case. Much has been written about the hospital's and the university's failures in this case. But what about the deafening silence from the Canadian bioethics community? Given the duty of bioethicists to "speak truth to power", this silence is troubling. To date, nothing has been written about the silence. This article is intended as a partial remedy. As well, the article pays tribute to heretofore unsung heroes among Dr. Olivieri's research colleagues.
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Journal of Medical Ethics 2004 February; 30(1): 61-62

Abstract: This article describes how a small but vocal group of biomedical scientists propagates the views that either HIV is not the cause of AIDS, or that it does not exist at all. When these views were rejected by mainstream science, this group took its views and arguments into the public domain, actively campaigning via newspapers, radio, and television to make its views known to the lay public. I describe some of the harmful consequences of the group's activities, and ask two distinct ethical questions: what moral obligations do scientists who hold such minority views have with regard to a scientifically untrained lay audience, and what moral obligations do mainstream newspapers and government politicians have when it comes to such views. The latter question will be asked because the "dissidents" succeeded for a number of years in convincing the South African government of the soundness of their views. The consequences of their stance affected millions of HIV infected South Africans severely.
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Faunce, T.; Bolsin, S.; Chan, W.-P.

**Supporting whistleblowers in academic medicine: training and respecting the courage of professional conscience**

*Abstract:* Conflicts between the ethical values of an organisation and the ethical values of the employees of that organisation can often lead to conflict. When the ethical values of the employee are considerably higher than those of the organisation the potential for catastrophic results is enormous. In recent years several high profile cases have exposed organisations with ethical weaknesses. Academic medical institutions have exhibited such weaknesses and when exposed their employees have almost invariably been vindicated by objective inquiry. The mechanisms that work to produce such low ethical standards in what should be exemplary organisations are well documented and have been highlighted recently. The contribution of elements of medical training in eroding ethical standards of medical students have also been emphasised recently and strategies proposed to reduce or reverse this process. The ability to rapidly change the ethical and professional culture of graduate medical trainees may help to deal with some of the perceived problems of declining ethical standards in academic medicine.
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**Better governance in academic health sciences centres: moving beyond the Olivieri/Apotex Affair in Toronto**

*Abstract:* The Toronto experience suggests that there may be several general lessons for academic health sciences complexes to learn from the Olivieri/Apotex affair (OAA) regarding the ethics, independence, and integrity of clinical research sponsored by for profit enterprises. From a local perspective, the OAA occurred when there already was a focus on the complex and changing relationships among the University of Toronto, its medical school, the fully affiliated teaching hospitals, and off campus faculty because of intertwined interests and responsibilities. The OAA became a catalyst that accelerated various systemic reforms, particularly concerning academic/industry relations. In this article, the evolving governance framework for the Toronto academic health sciences complex is reviewed and these policy and process reforms discussed. These reforms have created collaborative activity among research ethics boards and contract research offices of the partner institutions, and allowed the joint university/hospital ethics centre to play a role in governance and policy, while respecting the missions and mandates of the involved institutions. Although few of the policies are dramatically innovative, what is arguably novel is the elaboration of an overarching governance framework that aims to move ethics to a central focus in the academic complex. Time alone will tell how sustainable and effective these changes are.
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