Collaborative Discussion 2 - Peer response 2 (Julius)

Julius provides a clear analysis grounded in professional codes, correctly identifying that withholding negative findings would violate BCS principles 1a and 1b regarding public safety and consumer rights (BCS, 2022). His integration of German advertising law demonstrates awareness of cross-jurisdictional legal implications, while his emphasis on reputational risk acknowledges the broader consequences beyond formal compliance. Dalbir strengthens this foundation by emphasising that data professionals must consider public trust erosion when information is misrepresented (Floridi and Taddeo, 2022), proposing that researchers should flag the most robust findings to prevent selective interpretation. Thaimu offers valuable critique, suggesting the analysis would benefit from broader ethical frameworks beyond professional codes and deeper engagement with statistical ethics literature, particularly regarding p-hacking and selective reporting (Head et al., 2015).

The thread demonstrates strong convergence on fundamental principles whilst revealing areas for deeper analysis. Julius's focus on BCS principles aligns with established professional obligations, though Thaimu correctly identifies that broader ethical frameworks would strengthen the argument. Dalbir's emphasis on active safeguards against selective reporting echoes Mittelstadt's (2022) argument that principles alone are insufficient, supporting the view that professionals must anticipate misuse of their work. However, the discussion could benefit from greater emphasis on immediate practical obligations. The American Statistical Association's requirement for comprehensive reporting of limitations and uncertainties (ASA, 2018) directly addresses Abi's situation, while whistleblower protection legislation provides concrete pathways when public health risks are identified. Thaimu's reference to the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (ALLEA, 2023) introduces important supranational standards that complement national professional codes.

The synthesis reveals that professional responsibility operates across multiple frameworks: national professional codes, international research integrity standards, legal compliance, and public accountability. Dalbir's question about formally requiring researchers to flag robust findings is particularly pertinent, suggesting the profession needs clearer mechanisms to prevent selective interpretation. All colleagues converged on the principle that technical competence must serve public welfare, though the discussion would benefit from greater integration of statistical ethics literature and concrete implementation strategies for ensuring comprehensive reporting in commercial research contexts.

References:

ALLEA. (2023). *The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity*. Revised edition. Berlin: All European Academies.

American Statistical Association. (2018). *Ethical Guidelines for Statistical Practice*. ASA.

BCS. (2022). *Code of Conduct for BCS Members*. British Computer Society.

Floridi, L. and Taddeo, M. (2022). What is data ethics? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 380(2224), 20210162.

Head, M.L. et al. (2015). The extent and consequences of p-hacking in science. *PLoS Biology*, 13(3), e1002106.

Mittelstadt, B.D. (2022). Principles alone cannot guarantee ethical AI. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 4(8), 659-670.