

knew the relevant rules before committing the offense. The same reasoning holds true for entities which publish scholarly articles or books, with relation to potential authors who might or might not understand the rules about academic integrity. Since educational institutions have, as their principal mission, teaching knowledge and certain competencies, as well as the certification of the worthiness of individuals receiving the diplomas they issue, honesty on the part of learners and instructors is of the greatest consequence and seriousness to society in general. Some universities have long used "Honor Codes," or "Academic Honesty Agreements," as a form of fulfilling their obligation to inform and to oblige concordance with explicit, although sometimes somewhat generalized, rules concerning plagiarism. There is evidence that the practice effectively reduces dishonesty. This presentation will offer a range of models, from the simple to the complex, of Honor Codes, that is, of "self-declarations" of cognizance of the rules concerning individual work submitted for evaluation in courses or other learning programs. The wording of such codes, their application, the participation of students in the adjudication of alleged violations of academic dishonesty, the use of online tutorials explaining academic community values, the protection given to informers, the penalties frequently involved, and where to find further detailed information on the subject will be offered.

References

1. Garvey WD. Communication: The essence of science. Oxford: Pergamon Press; 1979. 332 p.
2. Posner RA. The little book of plagiarism. New York: Pantheon; 2009. 128 p.

CO.06

Scientific integrity: Revisiting the concept

M. Patrão Neves^{1,3}, A. S. Carvalho^{1,2}, J. Araújo^{1,2,4}, M. C. Cassimiro^{1,4}

¹Bioethics Institute, Catholic University of Portugal, Porto, Portugal; ²Office of Ethical Evaluation and Science Integrity, Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology, Lisbon, Portugal; ³University of the Azores, Ponta Delgada, Portugal; ⁴Scientific Integrity Committee, Oswaldo Cruz Institute, Oswaldo Cruz Foundation (IOC/FIOCRUZ), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Correspondence: J. Araújo (araujojoana@gmail.com)

Research Integrity and Peer Review 2017, **2(Suppl 1):CO.06**

We are witnessing an increasing multiplication and complexity of the regulatory codes establishing the correct behavior to comply with scientific integrity, in response to new situations challenging the common concept of integrity. This leads to a proliferation of norms, without coherent articulation or any attempt to categorize and rank the multiple expressions of integrity. In the field of scientific research, "integrity" is defined through the identification and characterization of specific situations that constitute actual risks of violating it. From a chronological perspective, identifying improper behaviors often precedes the development of the necessary rules to prevent them; this influences the evolution of the concept, prioritizing the negative – what cannot be done – over the positive in the conceptual definition of scientific integrity – what ought to be done –, which constitutes a first characteristic of the conceptual definition of scientific integrity. A second one is the primacy given to the evaluation of the action according to its impact on the research, the researchers and their institutions, over the principles that ground them and the telos or purpose of scientific research, that is, the advancement of knowledge and innovation, in qualitative and quantitative terms. Any action challenging these objectives falls under deontological (professional practice) and also, possibly, moral (character of the actor) scrutiny. Although the definition of "scientific integrity" remains duly open, it is possible to systematize some axial principles in responsible research and innovation that are paramount for scientific integrity: truth, rigor and objectivity; independence, impartiality and neutrality; cooperation and honesty; transparency and fairness; commitment and social responsibility. These allow us to propose an objective and comprehensive definition of "scientific integrity", as well as a coherent framework to firmly establish the procedures required during the research process, and to classify violations to it, contributing to the elaboration of a common standard for global research.

References

1. Davis MS, Riske-Morris M, Diaz SR. Causal factors implicated in research misconduct: Evidence from ORI case files. *Sci Eng Ethics*. 2007; 13:395-414.
2. Kaiser, M. The integrity of science—Lost in translation? *Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol*. 2014; 28:339-347.
3. Fanelli, D. How many scientists fabricate and falsify research? A systematic review and meta-analysis of survey data. *PLoS One*. 2009; 4(5):e5738. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0005738.
4. Office of Research Integrity (US) Annual Report 2012. [Internet] US Department of Health and Human Services. [Internet] Available at: https://ori.hhs.gov/images/ddblock/ori_annual_report_2012.pdf. [Access on: 2016 Jan 27]. email: askORI@hhs.gov.
5. Lu SF, Jin GZ, Uzzi B, Jones B. The retraction penalty: Evidence from the Web of Science. *Sci Rep* [Internet]. 2013; 3:3146 doi:10.1038/srep03146.
6. Faunce TA, Jefferys S. Whistleblowing and scientific misconduct: Renewing legal and virtue ethics foundations. *Med Law*. 2017; 26:567-584.

CO.07

The current dynamics of the correction of the literature adds to the challenges for responsible science communication by science journalists: Insights from an ongoing project

S. Liskauskas¹, S. M. R. Vasconcelos^{1,2}

¹Professional Masters Program in Science Education, Institute of Medical Biochemistry Leopoldo de Meis (IBqM), Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; ²Science Education Program, Institute of Medical Biochemistry Leopoldo de Meis, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (IBqM/UFRJ), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Correspondence: S. Liskauskas (suzana.liskauskas@gmail.com)

Research Integrity and Peer Review 2017, **2(Suppl 1):CO.07**

Evidence of lack of integrity in scientific publications has grown rapidly since the 1980s. In the US, integrity and public confidence in scientists have always been the basis for justifying the granting of billions of dollars for research [1]. However, the untainted image of scientists has been challenged. Among the challenges are increasing cases of research misconduct [1, 2]. The fraud in stem cell research by Hwang Woo-Suk [3] is an example. This case received enormous public attention and showed that prestigious journals are not immune to bogus data. Today, while scientists are expected to boost their publication record – often within a short time – a commitment to research integrity is expected, and it is fundamental for reliable research [4]. Flaws in this process may partially explain the increase in the number of retractions. On the one hand, this increase favors the health of the scientific literature, but on the other, correcting the science imposes changes that include the way it is communicated to the public [5, 6]. Science journalists play a crucial role in informing the public about research results. The way these professionals deal with the correction of the literature is a concern. The single study syndrome [6], in which journalists use a single study to grab the audience's attention, for example, reinforces the concern, and the following questions seem reasonable: (1) What are the media responses to cases of retractions of great repercussion in science? (2) What is the familiarity of scientific journalists with mechanisms for the correction of the scientific literature? (3) What challenges do Brazilian journalists face in informing the public about the current dynamics of science communication? This project addresses these questions, drawing upon evidence from the academic and journalistic literature and upon the views of a sample of science journalists from Rio and São Paulo.

References

1. LaFollette MC. The evolution of the "scientific misconduct" issue: An historical overview. *Proc Soc Exp Biol Med*. 2000 Sep; 224(4):211-215.
2. Fanelli D. How many scientists fabricate and falsify research? A systematic review and meta-analysis of survey data. *PLoS One*. 2009 May; 4(5):e5738.
3. Cyranosky D. Woo Suk Hwang convicted, but not of fraud. *Nature*. 2009 Oct; 461 (7268): 1181.
4. Schwartzman S. Publicar ou morrer. 27 dez. 2013. In: <http://www.schwartzman.org.br/sitesimon/?p=4777&lang=pt-br> [cited 2016 July 31]
5. Marcus A, Oransky I. Science publishing: The paper is not sacred. *Nature*. 2011 Dec; 480 (7378): 449-450.
6. Oransky I. How publish or perish promotes inaccuracy in science-and journalism. *AMA J Ethics*. 2015 Dec; 17(12):1172-1175.