Summary Post

The severe effects of research misconduct on social, legal, and even the researchers themselves are illustrated by Abi's case. That demonstrated how crucial it is to adhere to ethical standards for research, despite potential conflicts of interest with investors.

Misrepresentation, data fabrication, and unauthorized use of other people's words or ideas are all examples of research misconduct. False information in the literature or the persistent citation of retracted work are examples of scientific misconduct that may result in serious consequences, such as the spread of preventable diseases or the death of human beings. Even though there have been many complaints of inappropriate behaviour, the investigation's difficult to verify, about 0.01% of them have been shown to be valid. Researchers who are discovered to have engaged in misconduct end up losing funds, having their study retracted, and even running the risk of losing their employment (American Psychological Association, 2008).

As Gurkan suggested that including conflict of interest disclosures in the research might greatly increase the report's transparency and credibility. Concerns, problems, or possible threats to such organizations or agencies should be known to ethical review boards in their capacity (Gurkan, 2023). Falsification, fabrication, and plagiarism (FFP) are US federal offences that can result in harsh fines, loss of grant eligibility, and even possible imprisonment (Health and Human Services, N.D.). The retraction research can be listed in the retraction database with conflict of interest and duplication of data as reasons for Abi's case if guilty (Retraction Database, 2023).

Researchers should comply with international guidelines of good clinical practice (GCP) (EMA, 2022) and other ethical and scientific standards. The Singapore Statement, for example, is a potent, broadly accepted proclamation that is mentioned in virtually all continental and national standards of conduct on ethics in research (David & Adil, 2014). A more focused agreement must be reached in the future, ideally through co-creation amongst the important stakeholders.
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