

RMPP Unit 8 Discussion Forum 2

Peer Response 2

Thank you, Sherelle, for the information post on the ethical implications that Abi should consider as a researcher in clearly representing the research findings (Garwood, 2023). Furthermore, the supportive evidence of the BCS Code of Conduct and International Committee of Medical Journal Editors recommendations would put Abi's reputation at significant risk.

An aspect to consider further would be the legal ramifications should Abi choose to misrepresent the data findings. In the UK, intentionally misrepresenting data could have severe repercussions and consider deception, which could lead to criminal proceedings. In this scenario, Abi could break the Fraud Act 2006, which defines an intention to deceive and cause a gain for the Whizzz cereal manufacturer (UK Government, 2006).

Should Abi misrepresent the data and the manufacturer deliver inaccurate findings, they may also breach the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulation 2008 (UK Government, 2008). The legislation is aimed at stopping manufacturers from making false claims about a product.

Furthermore, the Advertising Standards Agency could enforce the CAP code, which suggests that any product must not mislead consumers (Advertising Standards Authority, 2023).

Advertising Standards Authority. (2023). Relevant Code rule. Available from:
https://www.asa.org.uk/type/capcode/code_rule/15.6.html?_vhid=BDA3D624DFB8865BE0CC38B979EC118B [Accessed 15 March 2023].

Garwood, S. (2023). Collaborative Learning Discussion 2 Initial Post. Available from:
<https://www.my-course.co.uk/mod/forum/discuss.php?d=146580&parent=214781>
[Accessed 20 March 2023].

Uk Government. (2006). Fraud Act 2006. Available from:
<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/35/contents> [Accessed 20 March 2023].

Uk Government. (2008). The Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008. Available from: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2008/1277/contents/made>
[Accessed 20 March 2023].