

## Peer Response to Shouta

I agree with Agne that Abi shouldn't waste time reporting his client to the National Food Crime Unit, and I'd want to add two points: has enough data been obtained, and is Abi the sole researcher on this project?

The fact that some data was obtained was reported first; nevertheless, it is unclear whether or not all of the required data has been collected. Moreover, the company releasing the product may have hired more researchers to bolster the reliability of the information. According to Silberzahn, even when working with identical datasets, different researchers might come to vastly different conclusions (Silberzahn et al., 2018). Abi may be one of several researchers here; if the company chooses to publish just the positive results under his name, then he would have legal recourse.

## Reference

(Silberzahn, 2018) Many analysts, one data set: Showing how analytic decisions effect outcomes. 1: 337–356. doi:10.1177/2515245917747646

## Peer Response to Andrijina

Although researchers are not obligated to reveal unfavorable results, I agree with you that doing so might be beneficial to the public. The case study used in this talk is no different, and we can see the precarious position he was in when he had to make a decision. The public and Abi's job would suffer if she chose to only release positive information. First, the public's safety, health, property, and well-being must be protected at all costs. Therefore, experts like Abi are tasked with doing research in an honest and transparent manner, demonstrating their competence while avoiding potential biases and bias-inducing pitfalls. In addition, I agreed with you that it would be the manufacturer's fault if Abi didn't provide both findings. A person's right to privacy, however, is safeguarded by the UK Research Integrity Office Code of Practice for Research if he has concerns. If scientists feel that their findings are being misused, they are encouraged to speak out to the appropriate authorities. Abi must inform his superiors of the findings of both studies; otherwise, the company might face legal repercussions if it continues production without addressing the issue.

## Summary Post:

I agree that doing so could be to the benefit of the general population.

The case study that was utilized in this presentation is not any different, and it allows us to see the difficult situation that the individual had to be in when they had to make a choice. If Abi were to only provide good material, it would be to the detriment of both the public and her career. Before everything else, it is imperative that the public's safety, health, property, and overall well-being be preserved at all costs.

Therefore, knowledgeable individuals like as Abi are entrusted with doing research in an ethical and open way, exhibiting their level of expertise while avoiding any prejudices and mistakes that might lead to the development of bias. The fact that some data was gathered was first published; however, it is now unknown whether or not all of the necessary data has been collected. In addition, the firm that is launching the product may have increased the number of researchers it employs in order to improve the information's credibility.

## Reference

Kampschoer, T. (2022) Nestlé's war on two fronts: A case study into the child labour accusations against Nestlé.

Mlinarić, A., Horvat, M. & Smolčić, V. S. (2017) Dealing with the Positive Publication Bias: Why You Should Really Publish Your Negative Results. *Biochemia Medica* 27(3): 447-452.