Peer Response

Thanks, Gurkan, it is an informative post about the review of the Abi and Whizzz case. Notably identified the best practice for the report to the institution to avoid potentially biased publication.

Research misconduct involves the misrepresentation, fabrication of data or the unauthorized use of another person's words or ideas. Misbehaviour must have been intentional, and sufficient evidence must exist to substantiate the charge. Misconduct also includes violating authorship or publication rights, as well as violating confidentiality.

A full investigation of an allegation is essential since researchers who really are found guilty of misconduct face the possibility of losing government funding, having their research restricted to under supervision, or possibly losing their jobs. Despite numerous allegations of inappropriate behaviour, just around 0.01% of complaints can be verified to be factual.

This matter must be improved by several parties working together. The development of a globally recognized organization for research integrity is not quite possible, however, the field may come together and be inspired by a powerful, widely endorsed declaration. Such as the Singapore Statement, which is referenced in almost all continental and national codes of conduct on research integrity (David & Adil, 2014). Future efforts are required to reach a more specific consensus, ideally through co-creation amongst the key parties.
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