Hi Choyee,

I enjoyed the element of reflection in your response. It’s well-reasoned and shows both self-awareness and professional integrity. You effectively recognise the tension between client expectations and ethics, and your emphasis on the broader consequences of selective reporting aligns closely with the ACM Code of Ethics (2018). The discussion of legal implications under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations (2008) adds further depth, highlighting that Abi could be at risk of breaking the law if his actions result in harm to consumers. This link is something that some peer analyses overlooked, so well done.

From an academic perspective, your response could be improved through a deeper theoretical engagement and broader referencing. For instance, integrating perspectives from research ethics or data integrity literature (e.g. Simmons, Nelson and Simonsohn, 2011) would strengthen your point about the dangers of selective reporting.

Structurally, your writing is clear and reflective, but it could benefit from a critical exploration of organisational pressures or systemic incentives that make ethical decision-making difficult. Overall, your post persuasively conveys your point but could be made even stronger through engagement with wider ethical theory and empirical research.  
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Hi Victoria,  
  
Your discussion shows a strong understanding of the ethical challenges raised by Abi’s case. I appreciated the engagement with Corrêa et al. (2023) to highlight the wider implications of AI ethics in statistical practice- particularly in regard to activities such as cherry-picking and selective reporting. That said, the analysis could be strengthened by deeper academic integration. For instance, while you cite Corrêa et al. (2023), the argument would benefit from closer engagement with their specific ethical principles. The reference to the FDA and “Newgen (2025)” adds colour, but reliance on a non-academic news source weakens the scholarly tone; a peer-reviewed or regulatory document would better support your claims.  
  
Additionally, while you identify key ethical principles potentially violated by Abi, these could be explicitly tied to established frameworks like the ACM (2018) or BCS (2022) Codes of Conduct to reinforce the connection (or sometimes conflict) between ethical reasoning and professional duty.  
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