Chapter 1 : Singapore Statement on Research Integrity | Ethics Codes Collection

The World Conferences on Research Integrity were organized to promote exchange of information and to further discussion of ways to promote research integrity and harmonise efforts to foster responsible research practices.

These were all purchased from iStockPhoto. Less X Before you send your plan please ensure you have read the frequently asked questions. Below are terms and conditions that you must accept before you can submit your research plan. Allegations of any breaches or disputes should also be directed to gary. This platform is a service to connect researchers with research ethics advisers. Advisers must not provide advice with regard to a project where they might be involved in the research ethics review of that project or otherwise involved in the governance or conduct of that project. Advisers must not provide advice with regards to a project where they have a conflict of interest regardless of whether that conflict might be perceived or actual. Advisers must act with integrity and honesty when using this platform, including the provision of advice to clients of the platform researchers. Advisers must not misappropriate the original ideas, or other intellectual property, shared with them by researchers. If an adviser is employed by, or has a role with, a research institution then before providing advice an adviser must confirm that they are permitted to do under the policies of that institution. This platform does not indemnify advisers for their provision of advice to researcher clients. Advisers should confirm the degree to which they are covered by existing policies band seek appropriate advice with regard to the desirability of seeking additional cover. It is the responsibility of the adviser to pay all the relevant taxes, duties and fees that are required for the monies they receive from the platform for the provision of advice. Advisers are encouraged to seek independent financial advice with regard to their obligations. Basic advice would generally be in the form of around a paragraph of text reflecting on what kind of shape the project described by the submitted research design is in and some dot points of the most significant ethical challenges and difficulties. Full advice would reflect upon all of the significant ethical challenges and difficulties related to the submitted research design. This is likely to include suggested refinements or other changes to the design, the adviser should direct the researcher to relevant academic literature or other resources. The adviser might also usefully comment upon the matters likely to come up during research ethics review. The balance will be paid by EFT to the relevant adviser. An adviser must not solicit or otherwise seek payments outside of this platform or seek engagement from a researcher client for work that is provided by this platform. In communication with researchers, advisers must not use racist, sexist or otherwise derogatory language. Advisers are urged to approach communications in a collegiate, courteous and constructive manner. Advisers must not bring the Research Ethics Adviser platform to disrepute. Warranties The operators of this platform offer no warranties to users with regard to the uninterrupted operation of this service. The operators of the Research Ethics Adviser platform make every effort to keep the platform free of computer viruses and malicious software but the operators provide no warranties that the platform is free of viruses and malicious software. Users are urged to use an effective internet security software and keep it up to date. Transfers of payments to advisers will be commenced as promptly as possible and an email confirming the commencement of a transfer will be sent to the relevant adviser. The actual commencement of a transfer and the time a transfer takes can be dependent on a number of factors, such as interruptions to the online services of the relevant financial institutions. The terms and conditions that researchers must accept make it clear that the advice they receive is not a research ethics review and, though it is independent and experience advice, no guarantee is offered that there will be no difficulties when the work is submitted for research ethics review. The operators of the Research Ethics Adviser platform offer no professional indemnity or other cover to Advisers. Advisers are encouraged to arrange their own professional indemnity and other insurance cover, Advisers with institutional cover are urged to check that cover does include advice provided via the Research Ethics Adviser platform. The operators of the platform will maintain the confidentiality of adviser and researcher users of the platform. Aggregate or otherwise de-identified information about the operation of this platform including the provision of advice to researchers might be used to- improve the operation and functionality of this platform prepare a business case for seeking funding for the

development of the full platform advertise or otherwise promote this platform discuss this platform in academic outputs. I Agree to All Terms.

Chapter 2 : Singapore Statement on Research Integrity - Etikkom

The Singapore Statement on Research Integrity, drafted at the Second World Conference on Research Integrity, which took place in Singapore from July 21 to 24, , is an important step toward promoting ethical conduct among scientists around the world.

The value and benefits of research are vitally dependent on the integrity of research. While there can be and are national and disciplinary differences in the way research is organized and conducted, there are also principles and professional responsibilities that are fundamental to the integrity of research wherever it is undertaken. Researchers should take responsibility for the trustworthiness of their research. Researchers should be aware of and adhere to regulations and policies related to research. Researchers should employ appropriate research methods, base conclusions on critical analysis of the evidence and report findings and interpretations fully and objectively. Researchers should keep clear, accurate records of all research in ways that will allow verification and replication of their work by others. Researchers should share data and findings openly and promptly, as soon as they have had an opportunity to establish priority and ownership claims. Researchers should take responsibility for their contributions to all publications, funding applications, reports and other representations of their research. Lists of authors should include all those and only those who meet applicable authorship criteria. Researchers should acknowledge in publications the names and roles of those who made significant contributions to the research, including writers, funders, sponsors, and others, but do not meet authorship criteria. Researchers should disclose financial and other conflicts of interest that could compromise the trustworthiness of their work in research proposals, publications and public communications as well as in all review activities. Researchers should limit professional comments to their recognized expertise when engaged in public discussions about the application and importance of research findings and clearly distinguish professional comments from opinions based on personal views. Reporting Irresponsible Research Practices: Researchers should report to the appropriate authorities any suspected research misconduct, including fabrication, falsification or plagiarism, and other irresponsible research practices that undermine the trustworthiness of research, such as carelessness, improperly listing authors, failing to report conflicting data, or the use of misleading analytical methods. Responding to Irresponsible Research Practices: Research institutions, as well as journals, professional organizations and agencies that have commitments to research, should have procedures for responding to allegations of misconduct and other irresponsible research practices and for protecting those who report such behavior in good faith. When misconduct or other irresponsible research practice is confirmed, appropriate actions should be taken promptly, including correcting the research record. Research institutions should create and sustain environments that encourage integrity through education, clear policies, and reasonable standards for advancement, while fostering work environments that support research integrity. Researchers and research institutions should recognize that they have an ethical obligation to weigh societal benefits against risks inherent in their work. Did you find what you were looking for? Give us your feedback! Thank you for helping us provide a better service. Fill in your feedback in the form below. E-mail optional The e-mail you entered, seems to be wrong.

Chapter 3 : The Singapore Statement on Research Integrity - Europe PMC Article - Europe PMC

The Singapore Statement on Research Integrity was developed as part of the 2nd World Conference on Research Integrity, July , in Singapore, as a global guide to the responsible conduct of research.

They can be local, institutional or professional. They are not necessarily in line with responsible practice. The Singapore Statement The Singapore Statement on Research Integrity, published in , provides a handy framework for thinking about your responsibilities. As the product of a series of global conferences on research integrity, it summarises principles and responsibilities that apply wherever research is undertaken. It is available in English and 20 other languages. The Singapore Statement sets out four basic principles for responsible research: In the following section, you will be presented with four examples of improper behaviour. For each, decide which of the four standards honesty, accountability, professional courtesy, good stewardship it corresponds to. Some of the behaviours might fit more than one principle, but our suggested answer will give you an idea of how each principle can be applied to research. Poor planning that results in a failed project Example 2: Keeping an incomplete record of your research Example 3: Failure to report conflicting evidence Example 4: Not meeting review deadlines Our suggestion: Poor planning that results in a failed project goes against the principle of good stewardship. Keeping an incomplete record of your research goes against the principle of accountability. Failure to report conflicting evidence goes against the principle of honesty. Not meeting review deadlines goes against the principle of professional courtesy. The Singapore Statement then goes on to outline fourteen specific responsibilities that provide a good checklist to post above your desk. The following section provides more information on these fourteen responsibilities. Integrity Researchers should take responsibility for the trustworthiness of their research. Adherence to regulations Researchers should be aware of and adhere to regulations and policies related to research. Research methods Researchers should employ appropriate research methods, base conclusions on critical analysis of the evidence and report results and interpretations fully and objectively. Research records Researchers should keep clear, accurate records of all research in ways that will allow verification and replication of their work by others. Research findings Researchers should share data and findings openly and promptly, as soon as they have had an opportunity to establish priority and ownership claims. Authorship Researchers should take responsibility for their contributions to all publications, funding applications, reports and other representations of their research. Lists of authors should include all those and only those who meet applicable authorship criteria. Conflict of interest Researchers should disclose financial and other conflicts of interest that could compromise the trustworthiness of their work in research proposals, publications and public communications as well as in all review activities. Public communication Researchers should limit professional comments to their recognised expertise when engaged in public discussions about the application and importance of research findings and clearly distinguish professional comments from opinions based on personal views. Reporting irresponsible research practices Researchers should report to the appropriate authorities any suspected research misconduct, including fabrication, falsification or plagiarism, and other irresponsible research practices that undermine the trustworthiness of research, such as carelessness, improperly listing authors, failing to report conflicting data or the use of misleading analytical methods. Responding to irresponsible research practices Research institutions, as well as journals, professional organisations and agencies that have commitments to research, should have procedures for responding to allegations of misconduct and other irresponsible research practices and for protecting those who report such behaviour in good faith. When misconduct or other irresponsible research practice is confirmed, appropriate actions should be taken promptly, including correcting the research record. Research environments Research institutions should create and sustain environments that encourage integrity through education, clear policies and reasonable standards for advancement, while fostering work environments that support research integrity. Societal considerations Researchers and research institutions should recognise that they have an ethical obligation to weigh societal benefits against risks inherent in their work. Keeping in mind this framework for judging responsible behaviour in research in principle, the next step is to consider what we know about research behaviour in

practice, as a way of preparing you to live up to expectations and avoid potential problems. Find them and familiarise yourself with them. Useful links Singapore Statement on Research Integrity:

Chapter 4 : Home - World Conferences on Research Integrity

Singapore Statement on Research Integrity Print The Statement is the product of the collective effort and insights of the individuals from 51 countries who participated in the 2nd World Conference on Research Integrity.

Please note the codes in our collection might not necessarily be the most recent versions. Please contact the individual organizations or their websites to verify if a more recent or updated code of ethics is available. CSEP does not hold copyright on any of the codes of ethics in our collection. Any permission to use the codes must be sought from the individual organizations directly. Researchers should take responsibility for the trustworthiness of their research. Researchers should be aware of and adhere to regulations and policies related to research. Researchers should employ appropriate research methods, base conclusions on critical analysis of the evidence and report findings and interpretations fully and objectively. Researchers should keep clear, accurate records of all research in ways that will allow verification and replication of their work by others. Researchers should share data and findings openly and promptly, as soon as they have had an opportunity to establish priority and ownership claims. Researchers should take responsibility for their contributions to all publications, funding applications, reports and other representations of their research. Lists of authors should include all those and only those who meet applicable authorship criteria. Researchers should acknowledge in publications the names and roles of those who made significant contributions to the research, including writers, funders, sponsors, and others, but do not meet authorship criteria. Researchers should disclose financial and other conflicts of interest that could compromise the trustworthiness of their work in research proposals, publications and public communications as well as in all review activities. Researchers should limit professional comments to their recognized expertise when engaged in public discussions about the application and importance of research findings and clearly distinguish professional comments from opinions based on personal views. Reporting Irresponsible Research Practices: Researchers should report to the appropriate authorities any suspected research misconduct, including fabrication, falsification or plagiarism, and other irresponsible research practices that undermine the trustworthiness of research, such as carelessness, improperly listing authors, failing to report conflicting data, or the use of misleading analytical methods. Responding to Irresponsible Research Practices: Research institutions, as well as journals, professional organizations and agencies that have commitments to research, should have procedures for responding to allegations of misconduct and other irresponsible research practices and for protecting those who report such behavior in good faith. When misconduct or other irresponsible research practice is confirmed, appropriate actions should be taken promptly, including correcting the research record. Research institutions should create and sustain environments that encourage integrity through education, clear policies, and reasonable standards for advancement, while fostering work environments that support research integrity. Researchers and research institutions should recognize that they have an ethical obligation to weigh societal benefits against risks inherent in their work. The Singapore Statement on Research Integrity was developed as part of the 2nd World Conference on Research Integrity, July , in Singapore, as a global guide to the responsible conduct of research. For official policies, guidance, and regulations relating to research integrity, appropriate national bodies and organizations should be consulted.

Chapter 5 : Singapore statement - World Conferences on Research Integrity

"The principles and responsibilities set out in the Singapore Statement on Research Integrity represent the first international effort to encourage the development of unified policies, guidelines and codes of conduct, with the long-range goal of fostering greater integrity in research worldwide.

This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. This article has been cited by other articles in PMC. The 2nd World Conference on Research Integrity, held in Singapore July , , brought together participants from 51 countries â€" researchers, funders, representatives of research institutions universities and research institutes , and research publishers to discuss different aspects and issues related to the responsible conduct of research. During the Conference, the participants worked on a joint document as a global guide for responsible conduct of research. It was discussed before, during, and after the Conference and published as The Singapore Statement on Research Integrity on September 22, As a journal dedicated to the promotion of the culture of research integrity 1 - 3 , the Croatian Medical Journal participated in the work of the Conference and contributed to the development of the Singapore Statement. We publish it with the hope that the national bodies and organizations in Southeast Europe in particular and Europe in general will use the Statement to create or further develop their official policies, guidance, and regulations relating to research integrity. The Statement is available from its own site, at http: Singapore Statement on Research Integrity Preamble The value and benefits of research are vitally dependent on the integrity of research. While there can be and are national and disciplinary differences in the way research is organized and conducted, there are also principles and professional responsibilities that are fundamental to the integrity of research wherever it is undertaken. Principles Honesty in all aspects of research Accountability in the conduct of research Professional courtesy and fairness in working with others Good stewardship of research on behalf of others Responsibilities 1. Researchers should take responsibility for the trustworthiness of their research. Researchers should be aware of and adhere to regulations and policies related to research. Researchers should employ appropriate research methods, base conclusions on critical analysis of the evidence and report findings and interpretations fully and objectively. Researchers should keep clear, accurate records of all research in ways that will allow verification and replication of their work by others. Researchers should share data and findings openly and promptly, as soon as they have had an opportunity to establish priority and ownership claims. Researchers should take responsibility for their contributions to all publications, funding applications, reports, and other representations of their research. Lists of authors should include all those and only those who meet applicable authorship criteria. Researchers should acknowledge in publications the names and roles of those who made significant contributions to the research, including writers, funders, sponsors, and others, but do not meet authorship criteria. Researchers should disclose financial and other conflicts of interest that could compromise the trustworthiness of their work in research proposals, publications, and public communications as well as in all review activities. Researchers should limit professional comments to their recognized expertise when engaged in public discussions about the application and importance of research findings and clearly distinguish professional comments from opinions based on personal views. Reporting Irresponsible Research Practices: Researchers should report to the appropriate authorities any suspected research misconduct, including fabrication, falsification or plagiarism, and other irresponsible research practices that undermine the trustworthiness of research, such as carelessness, improperly listing authors, failing to report conflicting data, or the use of misleading analytical methods. Responding to Irresponsible Research Practices: Research institutions, as well as journals, professional organizations, and agencies that have commitments to research, should have procedures for responding to allegations of misconduct and other irresponsible research practices and for protecting those who report such behavior in good faith. When misconduct or other irresponsible research practice is confirmed, appropriate actions should be taken promptly, including correcting the research record. Research institutions should create and sustain environments that encourage integrity through education, clear policies, and reasonable standards

for advancement, while fostering work environments that support research integrity. Researchers and research institutions should recognize that they have an ethical obligation to weigh societal benefits against risks inherent in their work. Petrovecki M, Scheetz MD. Croatian Medical Journal introduces culture, control, and the study of research integrity. Marusic M, Marusic A. Discussing the future of the journal. Marusic A, Damjanov I. Ensuring the integrity of the published record:

Chapter 6 : Singapore Statement on Research Integrity: Authorship Criteria â€" Research Integrity in Law

racedaydvl.com Advance copy, embargoed until 22 September The Singapore Statement on Research Integrity.

Chapter 7 : Singapore Statement on Research Integrity | ORGANIZING CREATIVITY

The Singapore Statement on Research Integrity, drafted at the Second World Conference on Research Integrity, which took place in Singapore from July 21 to 24, , is an important.

Chapter 8 : Singapore Statement on Research Integrity | Research Ethics & Compliance

The intent of the Singapore Statement is to provide ethical guidance which research organizations, governments, and scientists can use to develop policies, regulations, and codes of conduct (World Conference on Research Integrity).

Chapter 9 : Singapore Statement on Research Integrity - Australasian Human Research Ethics Consultanc

The Singapore Statement on Research Integrity was developed as part of the 2nd World Conference on Research Integrity, 21â€•24 July , in Singapore, as a global guide to the responsible conduct of research.