

Initial Post

◀ Initial Post

Summary Post ▶

Display replies in nested form

Settings ▾



Initial Post

by [Fahad Abdallah](#) - Monday, 16 June 2025, 9:12 PM

Abi's ethical dilemma concerns data integrity, statistical responsibility, and professional conduct. While he does not alter the raw data, emphasizing only favourable analyses, despite contradictory findings, constitutes ethical manipulation. The British Psychological Society's Code of Human Research Ethics (2021) asserts that researchers must present data truthfully and without bias, ensuring no harm arises from their interpretations. The idea that "statistics can support either side" is a dangerous oversimplification. Selective reporting risks misleading stakeholders, especially in matters involving public health. Ferrara (2024) explains that ethical reasoning requires consideration of outcomes, analysis transparency, and avoiding manipulation, even when data remains technically unchanged. Therefore, Abi is ethically obliged to disclose *positive and negative findings*, contextualised within sound methodological explanations.

Abi cannot ignore the foreseeable misuse of his results. The World Medical Association's Declaration of Helsinki (2025) insists that researchers must safeguard participants and the public by ensuring full, honest disclosure of findings. Suppose Abi suspects the manufacturer will publicise only the positive data. In that case, he should take proactive steps, such as including a disclaimer in the report or negotiating terms that require publishing the complete analysis. From a legal perspective, misleading claims based on biased data may breach consumer protection laws. Ghapa and Ab Kadir (2021) note that advertisements and information spread through business must be true to oneself. The authors emphasise regulatory efforts. Abi might be directly involved in promoting lies, which might affect his workplace position.

Socially, selective disclosure of health information can lead to a lack of trust among individuals regarding scientific research. Abi ought to think about internal escalation or, in case of necessity, whistleblowing, which amounts to public interest disclosure in numerous jurisdictions. Finally, as an ethical person, Abi is not just a matter of computation. Maintenance of transparency, protection of societal interest, and refusal of influence by business organisations are key factors of ethics in computing and research activities.

References

ACM. (2018). *ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct*. Available at: <https://ethics.acm.org> (Accessed: 16 June 2025).

British Psychological Society. (2021). *BPS Code of Human Research Ethics*. Available at: <https://www.bps.org.uk/guideline/bps-code-human-research-ethics> (Accessed: 16 June 2025).

Ferrara, L. (2024). Ethical Principles. In *Ethical Reasoning in Forensic Science* (Vol. 41). Springer. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-58392-6_2 (Accessed: 16 June 2025).

Ghapa, N., & Ab Kadir, N. A. (2021). Information Regulation: A Measure of Consumer Protection. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 29(S2), 59–74. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.47836/pjssh.29.S2.05> (Accessed: 16 June 2025).

World Medical Association. (2025). World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Participants. *JAMA*, 333(1), 71–74. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2024.21972> (Accessed: 16 June 2025).

Maximum rating: -

[Permalink](#) [Reply](#)



Re: Initial Post

by [Kingsley Onyeemeosi](#) - Wednesday, 18 June 2025, 9:18 PM

Peer review

Thanks for sharing such insightful thoughts. Your analysis effectively underscores Abi's ethical obligations, e

[Chat to us!](#)

integrity and the risks of selective reporting, as supported by (BPS Code of Human Research Ethics | BPS - British Psychological Society (2021). Highlighting that emphasizing only favorable analyses constitutes ethical manipulation is a strong point, aligning with (Ferrara, 2024) which stresses transparency and outcome consideration. Your call for Abi to disclose both positive and negative findings with methodological context is well-grounded and promotes scientific integrity.

However, the application of the Declaration of Helsinki is slightly overstated, as it primarily applies to medical research. A more relevant framework specific to consumer product research could better address concerns for a cereal like Whizzz. Additionally, while you suggest practical steps like including a disclaimer or negotiating publication terms, these could be expanded with guidance from professional codes. Ethical Guidelines for Statistical Practice (2018) emphasizes proactive communication could prevent misuse.

Your discussion of legal implications, supported by Ghapa and Ab Kadir (2021), correctly notes potential breaches of consumer protection laws but could benefit from citing specific regulations, such as food labelling standards, to strengthen relevance. The mention of whistleblowing is apt, but further clarification on Abi's legal safeguards would enhance the discussion. Socially, your point about eroding public trust is compelling, though further elaboration on the broader societal impact of research misconduct, particularly for vulnerable populations like children, would strengthen the argument.

Overall, your response robustly addresses Abi's ethical and professional responsibilities, with strong academic support. Refining the applicability of frameworks and expanding on practical and legal protections would enhance its depth.

References

BPS Code of Human Research Ethics | BPS - British Psychological Society (2021). Available at: <https://explore.bps.org.uk/content/report-guideline/bpsrep.2021.inf180> (Accessed: 18 June 2025).

Ethical Guidelines for Statistical Practice (2018). Available at: <https://www.amstat.org/your-career/ethical-guidelines-for-statistical-practice> (Accessed: 18 June 2025).

Ferrara, L. (2024) 'Ethical Principles', pp. 5–13. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-58392-6_2.

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Reply](#)



Peer Response: Initial Post

by [Rodrigo Pereira Cruz](#) - Sunday, 22 June 2025, 2:58 PM

Fahad's entry manages to successfully outline the practical and psychological aspects of Abi's situation and possible actions, highlighting his researcher role as one of impartiality, yet one which must also be ethics-driven and whose findings must ultimately benefit society.

Ethics in research and how it is translated into practice is fundamental to rule out any potential misconduct either with the scientific method or the way results are presented to the world (Correia, 2023). Therefore, Abi must abide to ethical standards by denying the manufacturer results that only laud Whizzz's performance, thus still presenting an impartial perspective while also striving to avoid a situation that would be leveraged by the company to promote its goals at the expense of human health.

It is important to note the impact of corporate interests in research, as they can drive research agendas away from questions that are the most relevant for public health (Fabbri et al., 2018). This ultimately means that Abi will not be able to easily make a stand against the manufacturer, as his funds and resources are likely controlled entirely by his employer. Nonetheless, he must still strive to preserve his independence and morality by going against corporate interests that threaten human well-being.

References

Correia, M.I.T.D. (2023) 'Ethics in research', *Clinical Nutrition Open Science* 47(1), pp. 121-130. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nutos.2022.12.010>.

Fabbri, A., Lai, A., Grundy, Q. and Bero, L.A. (2018) 'The Influence of Industry Sponsorship on the Research Agenda: A Scoping Review', *American Journal of Public Health* 108(11), pp. e9-e16. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2018.304677>.

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Reply](#)



Peer Response

by [Ali Alzahmi](#) - Monday, 23 June 2025, 8:37 PM

[Chat to us!](#)

Fahad, your post illustrates the moral conflict that Abi is afraid of striking between statistical truth and professional ethics. Even though Abi does not change the initial information, picking and choosing only positive results and obscuring evidence to the contrary constitutes ethical manipulation. Regarding digital health technologies, as Galetsi et al. (2023) emphasise, moral responsibility involves the honest reporting of data and thoughtful communication that may not lead to misleading results, even though data may technically be identical.

Abi is responsible for extending past data accuracy to predicting misuse and taking actions to prevent it. According to Sand et al. (2022), the impact of the received information remains the responsibility of the professionals even in the sphere of health. Nevertheless, Abi must intervene if the manufacturer discloses positive outcomes selectively. This may involve in-house escalation, written disclaimers, or asking for contractual assurances of full disclosure. All these are based on moral responsibility and social safety.

You also correctly point out that biased data reporting related to health issues may infringe on consumer protection laws and harm professional reputation. Čartolovni et al. (2022) outline that clinicians working with AI and data to make medical decisions must respect ethical transparency and refuse to succumb to external influences that may skew the results. Abi must not only provide statistical labor but also ensure that statistics are not used to make commercial benefits at the cost of human health.

To wrap up, Abi will seek to reveal positive and negative results, properly contextualised and with proper limits. Whistleblowing may be morally acceptable when internal complaints are not resolved. Maintaining civic confidence and guarding against vulnerable individuals and groups is his first duty, reaffirming that computing ethics is concerned with data accuracy, integrity, courage, and social responsibility.

References

- Čartolovni, A., Tomičić, A., & Lazić Mosler, E. (2022). *Ethical, legal, and social considerations of AI-based medical decision-support tools: A scoping review*. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, 161, 104738. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2022.104738> (Accessed: 22 June 2025).
- Galetsi, P., Katsaliaki, K., & Kumar, S. (2023). *Exploring benefits and ethical challenges in the rise of mHealth (mobile healthcare) technology for the common good*. *Technovation*, 121, 102598. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2022.102598> (Accessed: 22 June 2025).
- Sand, M., Durán, J. M., & Jongsma, K. R. (2022). *Responsibility beyond design: Physicians' requirements for ethical medical AI*. *Bioethics*, 36(2), 162–169. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/bioe.12887> (Accessed: 22 June 2025).

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Reply](#)



Peer Response

by [Ali Yousef Ebrahim Mohammed Alshehhi](#) - Monday, 23 June 2025, 8:50 PM

Fahad, your post astutely outlines the multifaceted ethical issues Abi faces, particularly around selective reporting and the misuse of data in public health contexts. I fully agree with your assessment that, while Abi may not alter the raw data, his emphasis on only favourable results constitutes ethical manipulation. Masters (2023) reinforces this point by highlighting the growing ethical responsibilities in AI and data use, especially in health professions. Ethical reasoning must consider the method and the potential real-world impact of interpretations, even when the data remains unchanged. Your emphasis on transparency and the risk of public harm is significant. As Cobianchi et al. (2022) explain in their discussion on ethical dilemmas in AI-assisted healthcare, failing to disclose potential dangers—whether in clinical procedures or consumer products—can result in avoidable harm. Even in a commercial setting, such as the marketing of Whizzz cereal, the obligation to act ethically still applies. Abi's awareness of how his work could be selectively used gives him a duty to intervene by including a disclaimer, negotiating terms for complete publication, or taking further steps if necessary.

You also rightly point out that selective disclosure undermines public trust. Ripstein (2022) notes that tort law often extends responsibility to those who foresee harm and fail to act. In this light, Abi could face professional repercussions and potential liability if it is shown that he knowingly allowed misleading data to influence public decisions. To conclude, Abi has an additional role in computation. His actions must be transparent and ethical, where the law and ethics are also satisfied. Adopting a passive approach would render him part of the harm, which would mean anti-professional ethics since they are responsible for ensuring that no damage is caused to citizens. It would botch the quality of scientific research.

References

- Cobianchi, L. et al. (2022). *Artificial Intelligence and Surgery: Ethical Dilemmas and Open Issues*. *Journal of Surgeons*, 235(2), 268–275. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1097/XCS.0000000000000242> (Accessed: 22 June 2025).

[Chat to us!](#)

e

Masters, K. (2023). *Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence in Health Professions Education: AMEE Guide No. 158. Medical Teacher*, 45(6), 574–584. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2023.2186203> (Accessed: 22 June 2025).

Ripstein, A. (2022). *Theories of the Common Law of Torts*. Available at: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/tort-theories> (Accessed: 22 June 2025).

[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Reply](#)[◀ Initial Post](#)[Summary Post ▶](#)

You are logged in as Fahad Abdallah (Log out)

[Policies](#)

Powered by Moodle

[Site Accessibility Statement](#)

[Privacy Policy](#)

© 2025 University of Essex Online. All rights reserved.



Chat to us!