Collaborative research & Human participants and animal subjects

Does a project studying aggregated observational data on human subjects (say, the total number of road accident injuries per state per year) need Instutional Review Board (IRB) approval to receive federal funding?

Can you think of an example of a project that uses existing data, does not ask for human participants to perform anything, yet needs IRB approval and might not get it?

Suggest some ingredients which could lead to successful collaboration between two statisticians and/or between a statistician and a scientist.

"Mutual understanding and faith in each other is a key ingredient for successful collaboration. Both parties have to be proactive in sharing their new research results among themselves. In this way, everyone will learn new things and the project will continue smoothly."

Collaborative group sizes can be small or large. Identify some strengths and weaknesses of larger collaborative groups relative to smaller collaborative groups.

"Larger groups can 'get more done, faster,' particularly work that is procedural ormodular in nature. On the other hand, large groups can be difficult to organize and steer. Smaller groups permit closer one-on-one interaction and a form of efficiency."

Some practical considerations about group size

google: The Mythical Man Month

or, google: The free rider problem

or, think about incentive structures in large vs small groups (also, think about incentive structures for the group leader deciding who to add to the author list)

or, think about the right group size for your favorite style of research

What are the advantages and disadvantages of being a conscientious collaborator who (i) makes careful, thoughtful but timely contributions to the project; (ii) reads widely and takes the time to understand as much of the project as possible.

IT IS USUALLY ASSERTED THAT ALL AUTHORS SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE WHOLE PAPER, IF IT HAS THEIR NAME ON IT. IS THIS REALISTIC? IF NOT, WHAT SHOULD WE DO?

Would you expect a PhD thesis adviser to act like the conscientious collaborator of the previous question on your own thesis research?

"It depends on the personality of the thesis advisor. Sometimes PhD thesis advisors act like conscientious collaborators, particularly when co-authoring with students. Onthe other hand, very often advisors leave details and responsibilities on the shoulders of (capable) students while only providing high-level, general feedback."

What are some advantages and disadvantages of joining a project and then making a minimal contribution? Can this be responsible behavior? Consider the following example: you help a scientist carry out a statistical procedure and you help write up the paragraph describing it; you accept coauthorship on the resulting paper, while ignoring all other aspects of the paper.

"I believe that it is ethically permissible (although not commendable) to accept co-authorship for a relatively minor contribution. As long as the statistician in question meets the expectations of the primary authors and has no reason to question theirquality of work, I do not see any reason that he or she would be obligated to thoroughly study all aspects of the paper."

Is the proper price of an object
(i) the marginal cost of production, plus some modest markup.
(ii) the amount that a buyer is willing and happy to pay.
What is the relevance of this question to the RCRS issue?

How can one maintain a reasonable level of agreement within a collaboration on the expected involvement of each collaborator?