

The first piece that caught my attention while reading the ethics statement came in the Research Results section. It says "...can include falsification of one's own results, and sabotage of the results of others." I have definitely considered the ethics surrounding falsification of data but I had never considered foul play by others. I wonder how prevalent this is in science and if there are any famous cases of this behavior.

Another section that surprised me was the "Treatment of Subordinates" section. I was not expecting the ethics statement to include this area but it is nice to see that fair treatment of employees and encouraging mentorship are considered by the APS. I am curious though what, if any, power the APS has to respond to any mistreatment of subordinates. In particular, the "promote their timely advancement to the next stage of career development" is quite interesting because I can imagine there could definitely be scenarios where a researcher wants to keep a productive subordinate that can crank out research for as long as possible instead of training someone new.

I was very surprised to see a section on the ethics of Social Media. Having grown up with a lot of pop-culture scientists all over TV and then watching them engage in social media played a big part in my access to science before I came to college. It is fascinating that this section was largely concerned with the misrepresentation of science and how communication should be kept "non-specialist". It will be curious to see if this section of the ethics statement grows as our society becomes more entrenched in social media. On the positive side, I also wonder if more scientists should be engaging in social media, especially those whose work is funded by government grants, as a way to easily communicate the results of their work with the larger public.