1. Activities should be phrased as positive actions, aligning with the logical theory derived for the three types of ethical decisions
2. Nodes can be Permitted, Prohibited, Demanded, or TBD (Grey or Recommended)
3. A “Default child” makes the parent node demanded, prohibited, permitted, or TBD under normal circumstances, namely those not covered by its other children. An action with only 1 child should have that child be ‘Default’ and phrased accordingly. If its only child is something specific, it should have another child added as ‘Default’, or else should be merged with its specific child if the child doesn’t actually describe a new condition; in that case it won’t need children, Default or otherwise.
4. **Explanation:** A “Default” node is one you have to look at if none of the other nodes you have reached applies. You reach a node if the parent applies. E.g. all GR subtrees apply, so you reach the first level of them all, and therefore have to follow either the Default node or another node at the first level. **Rule:** A rule that applies in all cases can also be called “Default”
5. Nodes with either references or notes necessarily require their推奨値 to be listed under a child node, because references (参照) and notes (コメント) are child nodes, preventing the推奨値 from being directly attached to the parent. This is a limitation of the JSON format. In this case, the decision is expressed simply with a child “Default” node, which conveys the node’s recommendation as per rule #2.
6. References should be placed as close to their relevant nodes as possible. A reference will be placed underneath a node that directly applies to it. To avoid bloat/redundancy (maybe just until I create a collapsible tree), references that apply to more than one branch of a tree (or should it have to apply to all branches?) will be placed directly above them all (i.e. the same reference cannot apply to two immediate siblings, or to both a node and one of its ancestors – but cousins can share references). Nodes in one part of the subtree may have influenced decisions in another part (in particular, by not performing a certain action), but they will only be placed under nodes regarding actions they actually discussed. This is so that researchers know which papers contain relevant research, for reference purposes. This also allows researchers to know which papers in a subtree did not discuss certain research, which is helpful for understanding “Demands” nodes’ decisions.
7. Actions should be phrased as verbal/action statements, and conditions as “situations” or “cases,” usually with nouns.
8. Demanded nodes are themselves demanded (i.e. the parent is not the demanded thing under consideration unless there is a Default child).
9. ~~Prohibited and Permitted nodes can be imagined as conditions that either invalidate or do not invalidate the performance of their parent (or possibly another ancestor?), but should also in essence be independent such that it is clear that it is that specific condition that enables its subsequent recommendation/ruling/decision. Therefore, these nodes should also be considered to refer to themselves, like Demands nodes(? Except that doesn’t seem feasibly from a usability perspective, at least with a decision tre~~e~~).~~ See rule 18.
10. The structure of the tree should be designed so as to enable the outcome desired by the above rules. This goes without saying, but essentially, if it is necessary to reorder some nodes or switch parent/child relationships in order to follow these rules, then that restructuring is necessary and should be performed.
11. If there are multiple conditions or actions that are important, especially if they are ‘common questions’ in a subtree (e.g. “if the software in question is open source”), then the question/condition that is more likely to be readily apparent from a research paper, or that logically proceeds something else should come first. This may not be intuitive until you think from the perspective of the user of the tree.
12. All conditions that are vague or uncertain (e.g. “in some cases”) should be phrased as simply ‘Condition’ until they are clarified which is essentially a TBD condition. The only difference is that a Condition might actually have a non-TBD recommendation, which makes the Condition’s color not-grey.
13. A node should be TBD unless there are at least 2 agreeing sources, preferably 2 more in favor of one decision than another, erring conservatively before adjusting a TBD. For example, if a research paper and committee discussions both agree, then it can be changed. But if there is one agreeing and one disagreeing, or even no relevant papers, even if it seems somewhat obvious, in order to know why something has a ruling, it should remain TBD.
14. If a rule isn’t demanded, and isn’t prohibited (e.g. if it is good to do, but not required), it’s notated as “Permitted,” even though “optional” covers the “it’s okay not to do this” meaning as well, and in the example given, “recommended” might be more explicit, since ultimately the goal of ethics is to point out unethical things rather than to propose ideals.
15. **Explanation**: Several rules suggest prohibited states that would be permissible if consent from the 対象 were received. Although the rules for obtaining informed consented are explained elsewhere, particularly in the ACM/Menlo Report subtrees, many rules could benefit from explicitly knowing that if consent is received, the prohibition is waived (or that it cannot be waived even if consent is received, presumably because the target either cannot reasonably be considered informed when consent is given, or because there is nobody who can give the consent, e.g. to scanning the entire Internet). **Rule**: A “prohibited/permitted” combination rule for “Consent Required,” or some other concise way of expressing these rules would cut down on bloat in the tree, which currently takes the form of either additional text in the node description or additional repetitive child branches. I.e. 承諾あれば非倫理的ではない。承諾がなければ禁止です。承諾が必須です。, except more concise (ideally四文字以下).
16. **Explanation**: Some Demanded rules are impossible for the researcher to confirm, or require excessive costs that chill innovation if implemented with certainty, according to the Menlo Report. This calls for a distinction between absolutely and “best effort” Demanded nodes. Like “consent required” nodes, although what is absolutely possible and what is not can be inferred, it may not be immediately apparent to researchers, especially new ones, and especially when presented with a decision tree of this scale. Therefore, a demanded subclass should exist. It should be the same color as “Demanded” nodes, since all demanded nodes require action, but should have different text, e.g. 「出来るだけ必須」vs 「必ず必須」/ “Demands – Absolute” vs “Demands – Best Effort.” When writing these rules, pay close attention to Drafting Rule #1 in considering whether these nodes are actually demanded and not prohibited (i.e. whether they are actions and are best phrased positively).
17. For the time being, slashes (‘/’) are forbidden in class/subclass names, because they apparently cause a bug that prevents that tree from being displayed. There are apparently no problems caused by slashes in nodes.
18. The basic structure of a prohibited rule is: If you want to do X, if condition A, if condition B, then X is 禁止・非倫理的ではない. Stated logically, “if (prop p) & condA & condB, then OB-p (if 禁止) or (–OBp AND –OB-p) (if Permitted).” However, for a demanded rule, the rule is: “if condition A, if condition B, then X is 必須.” This is different because in the first case, X is stated at the beginning of the decision tree (i.e. is known to the user a priori), but in the second case, it is only introduced at the end. Often, this必須の場合 will show up underneath an action X as a branch off of the first case. In that case, the full structure of the second case would be If you want to do X, if condition A, if condition B, then Y is必須. Here, the fundamental difference between the two cases is that in the second case, the final predicate deals with a DIFFERENT proposition than the beginning of the statement. This is, however, purely a usability choice. Fundamentally, a demanded action is imposed externally on the researcher, and therefore a researcher can’t be expected to think of it and look it up as the first part of a branch in the tree. However, all other actions are in principle internally motivated. We denote the former type of action with a 〇 (the same symbol used for normal conditional nodes, because demanded nodes are colored and therefore do not need a special shape), and we donate the latter type of action with a ☆. Conditions/actions in a branch should be ordered such that the action referred to by a Permitted or Prohibited leaf corresponds to the nearest ☆’d (read ‘starred’) action to the leaf along that branch. Therefore, all internally motivated actions should be labeled with such metadata, which should then be used to convert them to the correct shape (which may be a ☆ but may be something else, depending on what is possible with the representation software).