Unit 7 – 9 Discussion Forum

Initial Post:

Abi's dilemma highlights how ethical issues arise not only from altering data but also from selectively applying analyses. Although he is not falsifying data, choosing statistical methods specifically to portray Whizzz favourably constitutes analytical bias. This violates core principles of integrity and objectivity in professional statistical practice (ASA, 2018). Misleading through selective testing can be as ethically problematic as direct fabrication because it distorts the evidence base and undermines public trust (Gelman and Loken, 2014).

Abi is ethically obligated to present both the positive and negative analyses, especially since misleading conclusions may affect consumer health. Research ethics frameworks emphasise transparency, completeness, and the duty to avoid harm, principles that apply regardless of whether the client prefers favourable results (Zwitter, 2014). Withholding harmful findings could therefore be interpreted as negligence.

While Abi cannot fully control how the manufacturer uses the results, he remains responsible for ensuring his output is accurate, clearly interpreted, and accompanied by limitations. If he anticipates selective reporting, he could provide a unified report that contextualises all findings, seek guidance from an ethics committee, or, if necessary, use whistleblowing channels, which are legally protected in many regions (e.g., Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998, UK).

Legal, social, and professional consequences of misleading reporting include consumer harm, regulatory sanctions, reputational loss, and erosion of trust in scientific research. Thus, full transparency is the most defensible and ethical approach.

Wordcount: 228

References

American Statistical Association (ASA) (2018) *Ethical guidelines for statistical practice*. Available at: https://www.amstat.org/your-career/ethical-guidelines-for-statistical-practice (Accessed: 3 December 2025).

Gelman, A. and Loken, E. (2014) 'The garden of forking paths', *American Scientist*, 102(6), pp. 460–465. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1511/2014.111.460

Zwitter, A. (2014) 'Big data ethics', *Big Data & Society*, 1(2), pp. 1–6. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951714559253

Response Post 1:

Hi Elias,

you highlight an essential problem around analytical flexibility, and I agree that Abi's approach constitutes more than a methodological oversight. Extending your point, Fanelli (2018) notes that practices which distort the evidential balance, such as selectively reporting favourable analyses, fall under biasing behaviours that undermine scientific credibility, even without direct data manipulation.

From a regulatory standpoint, the issue extends beyond ethics into compliance. The EU's General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002) mandates that any scientific assessment related to consumer health be complete, risk-oriented, and fully transparent. Selectively omitting adverse nutritional findings could therefore violate not only professional standards but explicit legal duties of consumer protection. Comparable expectations appear in the US FDA's scientific integrity framework, which stresses the obligation to avoid "misleading presentation of evidence" in commercial submissions (FDA, 2012).

International governance further reinforces downstream responsibility. The OECD (2021) emphasises that data professionals must anticipate how results may be repurposed and adopt safeguards when their work could mislead end-users. This aligns with the Singapore Statement (2010), which identifies honesty, accountability, and fairness as universal principles of research integrity, principles clearly compromised when Abi enables selective publication.

Ultimately, Abi's responsibility spans methodological transparency, regulatory compliance, and broader societal accountability. Selective reporting is not merely suboptimal practice; it undermines public trust across jurisdictions and contradicts foundational global standards for responsible research.

Wordcount: 222

References:

European Union (2002) *Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council*. Available at: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32002R0178 (Accessed: 09.12.2025).

Fanelli, D. (2018) 'Is science really facing a reproducibility crisis?', *eLife*, 7, e62101. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1708272114.

FDA (2012) *Scientific Integrity at the FDA*. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/office-chief-scientist/office-scientific-integrity (Accessed: 09.12.2025).

OECD (2021) *OECD Recommendation on Enhancing Access to and Sharing of Data*. Available at: https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0463 (Accessed: 09.12.2025).

Singapore Statement (2010) *Singapore Statement on Research Integrity*. Available at: https://wcrif.org/guidance/singapore-statement (Accessed: 09.12.2025).

Response Post 2:

Hello Nelson, your analysis strongly captures the ethical breadth of Abi's situation. Building on this, recent cross-national research governance suggests that selective analytical choices are increasingly viewed as epistemic malpractice. Leonelli (2021) argues that when analysts privilege outcomes that align with commercial interests, they compromise the epistemic integrity of data science and erode public confidence in evidence-based policy.

Legally, the implications extend beyond UK consumer protection. Under the EU Unfair Commercial Practices Directive (Directive 2005/29/EC), withholding material information, such as adverse nutritional findings, can constitute a misleading omission, exposing both Abi and the manufacturer to regulatory scrutiny. Likewise, the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) treats selective scientific claims as deceptive conduct, reinforcing that transparency is a global expectation, not a regional norm.

From a professional standpoint, international frameworks emphasise responsibility for downstream use. The IEEE Global Initiative on Ethics of Autonomous and Intelligent Systems (2022) highlights that data professionals have a duty to anticipate how their outputs may be repurposed in high-impact domains such as health. Abi cannot control Whizzz's messaging, but he can implement safeguards, integrated reporting, explicit caveats, and written warnings about misrepresentation, to satisfy both ethical and regulatory obligations.

Finally, selective reporting in nutrition research has historically contributed to public harm, as demonstrated by Ioannidis (2018), making Abi's precautionary responsibilities even more pressing. Escalation or refusal is justified where consumer safety is threatened.

Wordcount: 227

References:

ACCC (2023) *Misleading claims and scientific representations*. Available at: https://www.accc.gov.au/business(Accessed: 09 December 2025).

Directive 2005/29/EC (2005) *Unfair Commercial Practices Directive*. Available at: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32005L0029 (Accessed: 09 December 2025).

IEEE (2022) *Ethically Aligned Design: A Vision for Prioritizing Human Well-being with Autonomous and Intelligent Systems*. Available at: https://ethicsinaction.ieee.org (Accessed: 09 December 2025).

Ioannidis, J.P.A. (2018) 'The Challenge of Reforming Nutritional Epidemiologic Research', *JAMA*, 320(10):pp 969–970. Available at: doi:10.1001/jama.2018.11025.

Leonelli, S. (2021) *Data Science in Times of Pan(dem)ic*. Harvard Data Science Review, 3(1). Available at: https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.fbb1bdd6.

Response Post 3:

Hello Mariam,

you draw out the core tension in Abi's case very effectively. Building on your argument, selective reporting is increasingly recognised as a systemic threat to evidence-based decision-making. As O'Connor and Weatherall (2019) argue, even when data themselves are accurate, biased presentation can create "manufactured certainty," shaping public belief in ways that diverge from the underlying evidence, a pattern highly relevant to nutritional claims like those surrounding Whizzz.

Your point about public trust is also supported in international research governance. The World Health Organization (WHO, 2021) stresses that health-related evidence must be communicated in ways that minimise misinterpretation. Withholding negative nutritional findings would directly conflict with these global standards and could jeopardise consumer safety. Similarly, the Canadian Tri-Council Policy Statement (TCPS2, 2022) explicitly classifies selective disclosure as a breach of research integrity, reinforcing that this expectation is shared across jurisdictions.

From a legal standpoint, selective reporting could indeed expose Abi to risk. The US Federal Trade Commission (FTC, 2022) has increased enforcement against companies using misleading scientific claims, and expert contributors—like statisticians, may be implicated if they knowingly provide analyses that can be misrepresented. This complements your observation that reputational harm is a serious consideration.

Given these overlapping ethical and legal pressures, Abi's most defensible approach is full methodological transparency, explicit documentation of risks, and, if necessary, withdrawal from the project to avoid complicity.

Wordcount: 226

References:

FTC (2022) Health Products Compliance Guidance. Available at: https://www.ftc.gov/business-guidance/resources/health-products-compliance-guidance (Accessed: 11 December 2025).

O'Connor, C. and Weatherall, J.O. (2019) The Misinformation Age: How False Beliefs Spread. New Haven: Yale University Press. Available at: https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.2307/j.ctv8jp0hk

TCPS2 (2022) Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans. Available at: https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique_tcps2-eptc2_2022.html (Accessed: 11 December 2025).

WHO (2021) Guidance on Ethical Conduct for Public Health Communication. Available at: https://tdr.who.int/home/our-work/global-engagement/who-guidelines-on-ethical-issues-in-public-health-surveillance (Accessed: 11 December 2025).

Summary Post:

Across the discussion, a shared consensus emerges that Abi's dilemma centres on analytical bias rather than overt fabrication, yet the ethical implications are equally serious. My initial argument emphasised that selectively applying methods to portray Whizzz favourably violates fundamental principles of transparency and objectivity (ASA, 2018; Gelman and Loken, 2014). Peers expanded this view by highlighting both the structural and systemic nature of the issue.

Nikolaos reinforced that selective analysis constitutes a breach of research integrity, supported by evidence that the research community views comprehensive reporting as essential to trustworthy science (Malički et al., 2023). Tobias extended the critique by placing Abi's behaviour within the wider pressures of commissioned research, noting that client-driven financial incentives can systematically incentivise ambiguity. His suggestion of pre-registration as a protective mechanism illustrates how methodological safeguards can reduce the scope for "forking paths." Ali further argued that statistical integrity extends beyond data handling to encompass the framing and communication of findings, particularly critical when consumer health is implicated.

Taken together, the responses highlight that Abi's challenge is not purely individual but embedded in broader institutional and market dynamics. This aligns with international commentary that systemic incentives often normalise questionable practices (Chubb and Watermeyer, 2016). Therefore, while individual integrity remains central, effective solutions must also incorporate structural protections, such as pre-registration, independent oversight, and clear contractual boundaries regarding analytical autonomy.

Ultimately, full transparency is both an ethical duty and a mechanism for safeguarding public trust, regulatory compliance, and long-term professional credibility.

Wordcount: 245

References:

American Statistical Association (ASA) (2018) Ethical Guidelines for Statistical Practice. Available at: https://www.amstat.org/your-career/ethical-guidelines-for-statistical-practice (Accessed: 11 December 2025).

Gelman, A. and Loken, E. (2014) 'The garden of forking paths', American Scientist, 102(6), pp. 460–465. Available at: https://sites.stat.columbia.edu/gelman/research/unpublished/p_hacking.pdf (Accessed: 11 December 2025).

Chubb, J. and Watermeyer, R. (2016) 'Artifice or integrity in the marketization of research impact? Investigating the moral economy of (pathways to) impact statements within research funding proposals in the UK and Australia', Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1144182?urlappend=%3Futm_source%3Dresearchgate.net%26utm_medium%3Darticle.

Malički, M. et al. (2023) ‘Transparency in conducting and reporting research’, PLOS ONE. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0270054.

Zwitter, A. (2014) ‘Big data ethics’, Big Data & Society, 1(2), pp. 1–6. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951714559253.