

Summary Post

This discussion has highlighted the ethical and legal complexity of Abi's situation. Even if the data itself is accurate, presenting only selected results is ethically misleading, especially when public health or consumer safety could be affected (Ioannidis, 2005). Professional frameworks such as the ACM and BCS codes of conduct stress the importance of honesty, transparency and prioritising the public interest (ACM, 2018; BCS, 2022).

Several posts have emphasised that Abi must present all relevant findings. Gillon's principle of non-maleficence supports this responsibility to avoid harm by omission (Gillon, 1994). Marwa also referenced the Menlo Report, which states that researchers must consider not only what they report but how their findings may be interpreted by others (Finn and Shilton, 2023).

Murthy raised the challenge of unclear institutional guidance, described as a policy vacuum (Moor, 1985). In such cases, professional ethics become even more important. He also reminded us that Abi's duty extends beyond his employer to include consumers, regulators and society (Freeman, 1984). Principles such as beneficence and accountability must guide professional judgement (Beauchamp and Childress, 2013).

Jaafar added that Abi cannot ignore the consequences of how his work may be used. If there is concern that the findings will be selectively published, Abi could take further action by submitting a full report, consulting an ethics board or using a neutral platform to ensure transparency (Bouter, 2015).

In conclusion, ethical practice in data science requires more than technical accuracy. Abi has a clear obligation to report truthfully and in full, and to anticipate the potential impact of his work on public trust and wellbeing.

References:

ACM (2018) *ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct*. Available at <https://www.acm.org/code-of-ethics> (Accessed 20 July 2025).

BCS (2022) *BCS Code of Conduct*. British Computer Society. Available at <https://www.bcs.org/membership/become-a-member/bcs-code-of-conduct/> (Accessed 20 July 2025).

Beauchamp, T.L. and Childress, J.F. (2013) *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*. 7th edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bouter, L.M. (2015) *Perverse incentives or rotten apples?*, *Accountability in Research*, 22(3), pp. 148–161. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/08989621.2014.950253> (Accessed 20 July 2025).

Finn, M. and Shilton, K. (2023) *Ethics governance development: The case of the Menlo Report*, *Social Studies of Science*, 53(3), pp. 315–340.

Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P. and Vayena, E. (2018) *AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations*, *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), pp. 689–707. Available at <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5> (Accessed 20 July 2025).

Freeman, R.E. (1984) *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Boston: Pitman.

Gillon, R. (1994) *Medical ethics: four principles plus attention to scope*, *BMJ*, 309(6948), pp. 184–188. Available at <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2540719/> (Accessed 20 July 2025).

Ioannidis, J.P.A. (2005) *Why Most Published Research Findings Are False*, *PLOS Medicine*, 2(8), e124. Available at <https://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124> (Accessed 20 July 2025).

Moor, J.H. (1985) *What is computer ethics?*, *Metaphilosophy*, 16(4), pp. 266–275.