ENRIO2025

ENRIO 2025
Congress on Research Integrity Practice: Research Integrity, Power Dynamics and Safe Institutional Culture,

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

Edited by Helga Nolte
and Urša Opara Krašovec

UNIVERZA V LJUBLJANI
University of Ljubljana

22 – 24 September 2025
Ljubljana, Slovenia

ENRIO 2025 Congress on Research Integrity Practice:
Research Integrity, Power Dynamics and Safe Institutional Culture
Book of Abstracts

Faculty of Law, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia
22 – 24 September, 2025

Organized by European Network of Research Integrity Offices (ENRIO) and University of Ljubljana

Edited by Helga Nolte and Urša Opara Krašovec
Graphic design by Neža Tomori Kontrec

Published by: University of Ljubljana Press
For the publisher: Gregor Majdič, rector of the University of Ljubljana

Ljubljana, 2025
First e-edition.
Publication is free of charge
Digital copy of the book is available on: https://ebooks.uni-lj.si/
DOI: 10.51746/9789612977238
Recordings: https://videolectures.net/events/ENRIO2025
Congress URL: https://enrio2025.si/

Kataložni zapis o publikaciji (CIP) pripravili v
Narodni in univerzitetni knjižnici v Ljubljani

COBISS.SI-ID 257252355
ISBN 978-961-297-723-8 (PDF)

ENRIO 2025
Congress on Research Integrity Practice: Research Integrity, Power Dynamics and Safe Institutional Culture,
Book of Abstracts

22 – 24 September 2025
University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
@ Faculty of Law, University of Ljubljana

Programme Committee:

Helga Nolte, Germany; ENRIO; The Team Scientific Integrity; Chair of Programme Committee
Grace van Arkel, Netherlands; ENRIO; Integrity Office of Delft University of Technology
Carole Chapin, France; Ofis; ENRIO-Board; previous Congress Coordinator; Rectorat ESRI Île-de-France
Hjördis Czesnick, Germany; ENRIO; Ombuds Committee for Research Integrity in Germany
Vidar Enebakk, Norway; ENRIO; National Research Ethics Committee for Social Sciences and Humanities
Maura Hiney, Ireland; ENRIO; University College Dublin
Marten Juurik, Estonia; ENRIO; University of Tartu
Panagiotis Kavouras, Greece; HEAL-Link Office - Library and Information Centre, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
Michaela Lenčéšová, Czech Republic; Czech Academy of Sciences; Assistant of Program Committee
Vesna Leskošek, Slovenia; University of Ljubljana
Tom Lindemann, Luxemburg; ENRIO, Luxembourg Agency for Research Integrity
Ana Marušić, Croatia; ENRIO; University of Split School of Medicine
Urša Opara Krašovec, Slovenia; ENRIO, University of Ljubljana; Congress Coordinator
Anni Sairio, Finland; ENRIO; Finish National Board on Research Integrity TENK; previous Congress Coordinator
Loreta Tauginienė, Lithuania; Kaunas University of Technology, representative of the Research Council of Lithuania
Krista Varantola, Finland; Advisor of Programme Committee

Local Organising Committee:

Urša Opara Krašovec, Slovenia; ENRIO, University of Ljubljana; Congress Coordinator
Marija Bešter Rogač, Slovenia; Faculty of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, University of Ljubljana
Dejan Jontes, Slovenia; University of Ljubljana, Rector's assistant for organisation and communication
Vesna Leskošek, Slovenia; University of Ljubljana
Aleš Novak, Slovenia; Faculty of Law, University of Ljubljana
Nina Peršak, Slovenia; Unit for Research Ethics and Integrity, University of Ljubljana
Jasna Podreka, Slovenia; Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana

Tehnical support:

Tjaša Franko, Faculty of Art; University of Ljubljana
Mahima Rani, Faculty of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, University of Ljubljana
Jure Skubic, Faculty of Art, University of Ljubljana and Institute of Contemporary History
Mia Šket, Faculty of Law, University of Ljubljana
Amritha Vadakkoott Krishnakumar, Faculty of electrical Engineering, University of Ljubljana

ANTANA PCO, kongresna agencija d.o.o.

UNIVERZA V LJUBLJANI
University of Ljubljana

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Monday, 22. 9. 2025 — 08:00 – 18:00 Registration

TIME	Main Hall	Seminar 1	Seminar 3	Seminar 5	Seminar 4
9:00				9:00 – 12:00 Satellite 1	9:00 – 13:00 Satellite 2
11:00 – 12:00			Coffee break - Lobby		
		9:00 – 17:45 Satellite 5	12:00 – 13:30 WS02		
	13:15 – 14:45 Satellite 4		13:45 – 15:15 WS03	13:15 – 15:15 Satellite 3	13:30 – 15:30 WS01 Invited
15:15 – 15:45			Coffee break - Lobby		
	15:45 – 17:45 Roundtable Tensions between Ethics and Law				
18:00	Welcome Reception - Terrace				

Tuesday, 23. 9. 2025

TIME	Main Hall	Seminar 1	Seminar 3	Seminar 5	Seminar 4
9:00 – 9:30	Opening				
9:30 – 11:00	Keynote Session “Power Dynamics”				
11:00 – 11:30	Coffee break - Lobby				
11:30 – 13:00	Invited Session Empowerment	Session Research Culture	Session Trust in Science 1	Session Publication & Authorship	WS04
13:00 – 14:00	2 min Poster Presentation	Poster Walk			
	Lunch - Lobby				
14:00 – 15:30	Keynote Session “Training & Education”				
15:30 – 16:00	Coffee break - Lobby				
16:00 – 17:45	Session Training & Education	Session Power Dynamics 1	Session Handling Cases	Session RI & AI	WS05
19:30	Conference Dinner - Terrace				

Wednesday, 24. 9. 2025

TIME	Main Hall	Seminar 1	Seminar 5	Seminar 3	Seminar 4
9:30 – 11:00	Keynote Session “Trust in Science				
11:00 – 11:30	Coffee break - Lobby				
11:30 – 13:00	Session Trust in Science 2	Session RI Governance	Session Reports from Different Countries	WS07	WS06
13:00 – 14:00	2 min Poster Presentation	Poster Walk			
	Lunch - Lobby				
14:00 – 15:30	Session Power Dynamics 2	Session Healthcare	Session Concepts & Definitions	WS08	WS09
15:30 – 16:00	Coffee break - Lobby				
16:00 – 17:00	Concluding Remarks				
17:00 – 17:30	Farewell				

PROGRAMME

Monday, September 22nd

9:00 — 12:00

Seminar 5
High-level priority setting towards an agenda of actions and interventions to foster research integrity
Satellite Event 1
Organized by ENRIO and Science Europe

9:00 — 13:00

Seminar 4
Try-outs of research integrity trainings
Satellite Event 2
Organized by The Network for Education and Research Quality

9:00 — 17:45

Seminar 1
How do European funded projects promote research integrity policy and practice in the European Research Area: IANUS, POIESIS, VERITY, RE4GREEN, PREPARED, CHANGER and The Embassy of Good Science
Satellite Event 5

12:00 — 13:30

Seminar 3
Workshop - WS02

Presentations:
The Future is Now: AI, Academic Ethics and the Science Communication
Reda Cimmperman, Rima Sinickė, Kristina Puzarienė

13:15 — 14:45

Main Hall
Advancing Research Integrity in Slovenia: Developments–Challenges–Perspectives
Satellite Event 4

13:15 — 15:15

Seminar 5
2nd Global Satellite Research Integrity Networking Meeting
Satellite Event 3
Organized by ENRIO and The Netherlands Research Integrity Network with the support of African Research Integrity Network and Asian Pacific Research Integrity Network

13:30 — 15:30

Seminar 4
Workshop
Invited Workshop - WS01

Presentations:
Lessons Learned: The Importance of Early Integrity Risk Identification in Research
Grace van Arkel, Ibo Van de Poel

13:45 — 15:15

Seminar 3
Workshop - WS03

Presentations:
The BEYOND BAD APPLES Project's Resource Guides on Addressing Misconduct and Promoting Research Integrity
Rosemarie de La Cruz Bernabe, Kadri Simm, Tonje Lossius Husum, Alina Coman, Valerie Gaudin, Eero Kaila, Vivian Mbanya, Ian Slesinger, Signe Mežinska

15:45 — 17:45

Main Hall
Round Table
Tensions between Ethics and Law
Chair: Loreta Tauginienė

Moderated and Organised by Loreta Tauginiene
Participating: Teodora Konach, Asaël Rouby, and Jörgen Svidén
The central theme of the discussion will revolve around tensions between ethics and law. These tensions become particularly pronounced when legal compliance may compromise ethical standards or when ethical imperatives encourage actions that potentially challenge legal boundaries, requiring researchers to engage in complex decision-making processes that balance adherence to regulatory frameworks with commitment to fundamental ethical principles that underpin scientific progress.

18:00 — 19:00

Terrace
Monday opening reception

Tuesday, September 23rd

9:00 — 9:30

Main Hall
Tuesday opening session
Chairs: Helga Nolte and Urša Opara Krašovec, ENRIO2025 Congress
Miran Cerar, Dean of the Faculty of Law, University of Ljubljana
Bert Seghers, President of ENRIO
Gregor Majdič, Rector of the University of Ljubljana

9:30 — 11:00

Main Hall
Power Dynamics
Keynote Lectures
Chair: Vesna Leskošek

Presentations:

9:30 — 10:15
Leadership, Courage, and Responsibility: Addressing Gender-Based Violence as a Matter of Research Integrity
Marcela Linkova

10:15 — 11:00
Science under siege: Anti-gender mobilizations and the struggle over epistemic power
Roman Kuhar

11:00 — 11:30

Tuesday morning coffee break

11:30 — 13:00

Main Hall
Invited Session
Empowerment in Response to Abuse of Power
Chair: Maura Hiney

Organised by Helga Nolte and Urša Opara Krašovec
Moderated by Zoe Hammatt
Participating with short presentations: Jean-Pascale van Ypersele, Rosemarie de La Cruz Bernabe, and Nicole Föger
An open, safe, and inclusive research environment provides the foundation for research integrity (RI) in everyday practice. In a broader context, this also means recognizing fairness, equality, and diversity as essential components of RI that must be woven into organizational systems. Particularly in academic and research environments with a strong hierarchical structure, abuse of power presents an underlying problem that organizations often fail to acknowledge. Even fewer organizations implement measures to raise awareness about and prevent abuse of power, even though such measures are the only means of effectively protecting victims of such abuse when concrete cases emerge.
Empowerment is the antidote to abuse of power. Empowerment strengthens those affected, helping them to regain their voice and raise it against such abuse, to speak openly about the facts and stand up for the truth. It is also about joining forces with others, creating solidarity so that no one can be silently stripped of their dignity. We will explore ways to empower, particularly those most vulnerable in the research environment, encouraging the transformation of power from a tool of domination into a catalyst for individual and collective growth that enables science, and everyone, to thrive.

11:30 — 13:00 | **Seminar 1**
Research Culture
Chair: Nina Peršak

Presentations:

11:30 — 11:45 | **Responsibility in research: The relationship between open science, research ethics, and responsible assessment**
Laura Niemi, Janne Pölönen

11:45 — 12:00 | **Mental Health in Academia: surviving or thriving? Results from a nationwide survey on mental health and social safety in the Netherlands**
Joeri Tijdink

12:00 — 12:15 | **Dialogue towards ethical participation. A qualitative study of Deaf people's research experiences**
Tomasz Krawczyk, Jan Piasecki, Marcin Waligora

12:15 — 12:30 | **Assessing the perceptions, experiences and needs of researchers in Amsterdam for fostering a positive research culture**
Rita Santos, Miriam van Loon, Krishma Labib, Janette Huijser, Joeri Tijdink, Mariette van den Hoven

12:30 — 12:45 | **Empowering early career researchers to foster research culture change towards a responsible research climate**
Barbara Leitner, Joeri Tijdink, Mariette van den Hoven

11:30 — 13:00 | **Seminar 3**
Trust in Science 1
Chair: Anni Sairio

Presentations:

11:30 — 11:45 | **Searchable libraries of RI case reports and published decisions: how Scandinavia pioneers transparency, and a demo of a new Dutch tool**
Lodewijk Pet, Kalle Videnoja, Bert Seghers

11:45 — 12:00 | **College research ethics boards of Quebec, Canada (REBs) : mandate, governance and resources**
Emmanuelle Marceau

12:00 — 12:15 | **Extreme citizen science – challenges and opportunities of citizen engagement and inclusion**
Veikko Ikonen

12:15 — 12:30 | **Use of participatory techniques and roleplay for research integrity training: addressing complex situations and power dynamics**
Estelle Jaligot

12:30 — 12:45 | **Research Misconduct and the Law: Complementary, Underutilised or Misunderstood?**
Kritika Sharma

11:30 — 13:00 | **Seminar 5**
Publication and Authorship
Chair: Hjördis Czesnick

Presentations:

11:30 — 11:45 | **Upholding Research Integrity in a Changing Landscape: Insights from Springer Nature**
Asja Prohic

11:45 — 12:00 | **Predatory and papermill practices in a small predatory journal – A case study involving a journal with links towards Turkey, Pakistan and Iran**
Wouter Vandevelde

12:00 — 12:15 | **Fake papers with real authors, but unaware of the publication: how to fight, respond to and adapt to "forged authorship" / identity theft**
Bert Seghers, Wouter Vandevelde, Paula Saner, Hjördis Czesnick

12:15 — 12:30 | **What is Gender Bias in Grant Peer-review?**
Emre Özel

12:30 — 12:45 | **Epistemological Issues Relating to the Fabrication of Research Results**
Jovana Mihajlović Trbovc

11:30 — 13:00 | **Seminar 4**
Workshop - WS04

Presentations:
Unlocking Synergies: The IP-OS Best Practice Manual and Capacity Building Programme in 27 countries
Julia Priess-Buchheit, Marie Alavi

13:00 — 14:00 | **Lobby, Main Hall**
Tuesday lunch and 2-min poster presentations
Posters

Note that all posters, including those listed in this poster track with 2-minute presentations, will also be on display throughout the duration of the Congress.

Presentations:

13:00 — 13:02 | **European and Global landscape analysis: an overview of actors with a mission in research integrity**
Bert Seghers

13:02 — 13:04 | **Scientific Consulting in Ukraine: Black Side**
Artem Artyukhov, Nadiia Artyukhova

13:04 — 13:06 | **Research Ethics and Integrity for the Green Transition**
Fabian Fischbach, Dirk Lanzerath

13:06 — 13:08 | **Open infrastructure and scholarly metadata for research integrity**
Madhura Amdekar

13:08 — 13:10

RM Roadmap - Creating Framework Conditions for Research Management to Strengthen the European Research Area
Janina Bau, Teodora Konach

13:10 — 13:12

Prioritizing interventions and reproducibility measures to improve research reproducibility: a Delphi consultation method
Dora Pejdo, Ivan Buljan, Tamarinde Haven, Ana Marušić

13:12 — 13:14

A concerted approach to definitions of research integrity and related concepts: ENRIO's contribution
Helene Ingierd, Loreta Tauginienė, Michaela Lenčéšová, Edwin C. Constable, Tom Lindemann, Ana Marušić, James Parry, Cathrine Gill

13:14 — 13:16

Research Integrity Country Report: Belgium
Bert Seghers, Inge Lerouge, Marianne De Voecht, Stephanie Ruysschaert, Stefanie Van der Burght, Leyla Soslambekova, Martyna Bajorinaite, Danielle Balériaux

13:00 — 14:00

Lobby, Main Hall
Tuesday lunch and poster walk
Posters

Note that all posters will be on display throughout the duration of the Congress (Tuesday and Wednesday). Those listed in this poster track will not feature a 2-minute presentation.

Presentations:

Fostering a Culture of Research Integrity: The Role of the Scientific Integrity Counsellor at the Joint Research Centre
Tilemahos Efthimiadis

Direct and surrogate benefit in cancer clinical trials
Marcin Waligora

Challenges to ethics review of emerging technologies
Antonija Mijatovic, Ana Marušić

European Network of Ombuds in Higher Education
Markus Seethaler, Anna-Katharina Rothwangl

Resources for RI and RE Education
Lene Os Johannessen, Johanne Svanes Oskarsen, Ingrid Synnøve Torp

How can principles of research integrity be used to promote an open and constructive debate in the aftermath of research projects gone wrong?
Anna Holmesland, Maria Sandhaug Sandhaug, Camilla Bø Iversen

Using country reports to visualise the diversity in European national research integrity landscapes
Ana Marušić, Bert Seghers, Kalle Videnoja

Academic Integrity in Latvian Higher Education Institutions: Insights of Survey Findings
Laila Silamiķele, Matīss Reinfelds, Anna Stikāne, Rasma Pīpiķe, Raimonda Soloha

Ombuds Committee for Research Integrity in Germany as an Integrative Institution for Safeguarding Research Integrity
Martin Steinberger, Hjördis Czesnick

Mapping the variety of national research integrity actors in European countries: a country-report-sourced annotated map
Bert Seghers, Kalle Videnoja

Naming and defining scientific integrity: a challenge. The case of French in an international context
Bernard Harmegnies, Danielle Baleriaux

14:00 — 15:30 Main Hall
Training and Education
Keynote Lectures
Chair: Marija Bešter Rogač

Presentations:

14:00 — 14:45 **Power and empowerment in RCR training**
Mariette van den Hoven

14:45 — 15:30 **Training ethical researchers and creating a culture of integrity, wishful thinking or achievable goals?**
Mohammad Hosseini

15:30 — 16:00 **Tuesday afternoon coffee break**

16:00 — 17:45 Main Hall
Training and Education
Chair: Aleš Novak

Presentations:

16:00 — 16:15 **Can E-learning formats provide effective research integrity training for doctoral researchers at large institutions?**
Viktor Scholz

16:15 — 16:30 **The Open Science Learning GATE - Supporting Capacity Building**
Julia Priess-Buchheit, Marie Alavi

16:30 — 16:45 **Definition of Assessment Criteria for Research Integrity Trainings and Materials: Experience from the NERQ Peer-Coaching Group**
María Paula Paragis, Juliana Thomazini, Giulia Inguaggiato, Vinodh Ilangovan, Bert Seghers

16:45 — 17:00 **RCR training has no effect on European students' ability to handle grey-zones: results from a large scale survey across educational levels**
Mikkel Willum Johansen, Mads Paludan Goddiksen, Christine Clavien, Linda Hogan, I. Anna S. Olsson, Peter Sandøe, P.J. Wall

17:00 — 17:15 **A Competence Grid for the Teaching of Good Scientific Practice**
Roland Bluhm, Christian Dumpitak, Tina Rotzal, Lenka Schnaubert, Dominik Schuh

17:15 — 17:30 **Walking the talk about Open Science and Research Integrity in Greece**
Panagiotis Kavouras, Lia Ollandezou

16:00 — 17:45 **Seminar 1**
Power Dynamics
Chair: Jasna Podreka

Presentations:

16:00 — 16:15 **What does it mean to address power dynamics in research seriously?**
Krishma Labib

16:15 — 16:30 **How precarity and denied academic citizenship experienced by early-career researchers endanger research integrity**
Mirjam Heetkamp

16:30 — 16:45 **Learning from psychiatry: A scripted expert interview about personality traits (narcissism, perfectionism ...) and lessons for researcher assessment**
Bert Seghers, Joeri Tijdink

16:45 — 17:00 **Systemic silencing of gender-based inequality at universities: launching an independent European NGO in Belgium and the first survey on retaliation**
Bertanne Visser, Danièle Zucker, Urša Opara Krašovec, Jean-Pascale van Ypersele, Caroline Nieberding

17:00 — 17:15 **Power Abuse Trips in Research: What Fuels Them and How to Prevent Them**
Irena Ograjenšek

16:00 — 17:45 **Seminar 3**
Handling cases
Chair: Marten Juurik

Presentations:

16:00 — 16:15 **Hilfe! Help! Au secours!: How to Handle Transnational Cases of Research Misconduct**
Markus Seethaler, Sabine Chai, Tom Lindemann, Malte Fischer

16:15 — 16:30 **How transparent should institutions be about research misconduct?**
Signe Mežinska, Elīza Lasmane

16:30 — 16:45 **Annulment of Higher Education Diplomas – Terms and Conditions in Cases of Academic Integrity Violations**
Dace Raipale, Sanita Osipova

16:45 — 17:00 **Shared Responsibility to Address Questionable Research Practices? – A Study of Perceived Efficacy of Organisational Research Integrity Policies**
Simon Fuglsang, Serge P.J.M. Horbach, Mads P. Sørensen , Niels Mejlgaard

17:00 — 17:15 **Beyond approval: experiences and lessons from constructing research ethics review**
Marjo Rauhala

17:15 — 17:30 **Bad apples in which barrels?**
Sara Belfrage, Jonas Åkerman

16:00 — 17:45

Seminar 5
RI and AI
Chair: Tom Lindemann

Presentations:

16:00 — 16:15
Integrity Meets RAISA: The Harmonious Fusion of Human Ethics and AI Efficiency in Scholarly Excellence
Kerstin Kathy Meyer-Ross

16:15 — 16:30
Ethical AI in Academic Research: A Novel Course Model for Upholding Research Integrity and Embracing Institutional Responsibility
Hong-Ly Nguyen, Kerstin Kathy Meyer-Ross

16:30 — 16:45
Beyond Guidelines: Using the Anthology Format for Mediating AI-related Research Ethics
Hallvard Fossheim, Thomas Østerhaug

16:45 — 17:00
Who should create AI guidelines for researchers? – a research integrity perspective
Katrin Frisch

17:00 — 17:15
Writing Assistant, Workhorse, or Accelerator? Insights from a Nationwide Survey on Researchers' Use of Generative AI and their need for guidelines
Mads P. Sørensen, Jens Peter Andersen, Lise Degn, Rachel Fishberg, Ebbe K. Graversen, Serge P.J.M. Horbach, Evanthia Kalpazidou Schmidt, Jesper W. Schneider

16:00 — 17:45

Seminar 4
Workshop - WS05

Presentations:
Authorship and research integrity issues: Workshopping solutions to a chronic problem
Anni Sairio, Petra Falin, Eero Kaila, Kalle Videnoja, Oona Myllyntaus

19:30 — 21:30

Terrace
Conference dinner

Wednesday, September 24th

9:30 — 11:00

Main Hall
Trust in Science
Keynote Lectures
Chair: Krista Varantola

Presentations:

9:30 — 10:15
The Role of Institutions in Cultivating Trust in Science: A Qualitative Inquiry across Europe
Michel Dubois

10:15 — 11:00
Trust in Science and Technocracy Tolerance - two sides of the same coin?
Martin W. Bauer

11:00 — 11:30
Wednesday morning coffee break

11:30 — 13:00

Main Hall
Trust in Science 2
Chair: Vidar Enebakk

Presentations:

11:30 — 11:45
Roles and functioning of the European Union National Ethics Councils (NEC): a cross-sectional study
Zvonimir Koporc, Lisa Diependale, Edyta Sikorska, Livia Puljak

11:45 — 12:00
Promoting Research Security through Research Ethics and Integrity practices
Vasiliki Mollaki, Xenia Ziouvelou, Konstantina Giouvanopoulou, Vangelis Karkaletsis

12:00 — 12:15
Upholding scientific integrity in climate change in the R&I system
Janina Bau, Lorenzo Molina, Teodora Konach

12:15 — 12:30
Enhancing Research Integrity Training: The BEYOND Trainer Guide
Daniel Pizzolato, Erika Lofstrom, Anu Tammeleht, Giulia Inguaggiato, Josephina Antoniou

12:30 — 12:45
Increasing reproducibility through the co-creation of interventions that support a transparent and trustworthy research ecosystem-TRUSTparency project
Panagiotis Kavouras, Rosemarie de La Cruz Bernabe

11:30 — 13:00

Seminar 1
RI Governance
Chair: Grace van Arkel

Presentations:

11:30 — 11:45
Research Ethics Committees in Technical Universities: Challenges and Insights
Aive Pevkur

11:45 — 12:00
Updating the UK Concordat to Support Research Integrity: Modernising to Embed Good Practice and Increase Alignment across the Research System
Rebecca Veitch, Anne Taylor

12:00 — 12:15 **Handling alleged research misconduct across Europe: a comparative overview of national systems**
Lodewijk Pet, Yvonne Erkens, Frits Rosendaal

12:15 — 12:30 **Research integrity is also for the private sector! Early lessons from an ongoing initiative in France.**
Romain Pierronnet

12:30 — 12:45 **From 2015 to 2023, eight years of empirical research on research integrity: A scoping review.**
Baptiste Vendé

11:30 — 13:00 **Seminar 5**
Reports from different countries
Chair: Michaela Lenčéšová

Presentations:

11:30 — 11:45 **Good academic practices of Ukrainian universities**
Ülle Must, Stella Shapoval

11:45 — 12:00 **Perceptions of Ethical Breaches and Consequences: Results from the National Lithuanian Survey in Academia**
Rima Sinickė

12:00 — 12:15 **Law and Order for RI?: Research Integrity Governance in Austria on the Move**
Sabine Chai, Eva Korus

12:15 — 12:30 **Protecting Research from Foreign Interference: Risks and Challenges from the Lens of the French Office for Research Integrity**
Nathalie Voarino, Romain Pierronnet

12:30 — 12:45 **Experiences from the first five years of the National Board in Sweden**
Sofia Bergström, Magnus Eklund, Dorota Green, Magnus Gudmundsson

11:30 — 13:00 **Seminar 4**
Workshop - WS06

Presentations:
A primer to using open scholarly metadata for research integrity
Evans Atoni, Madhura Amdekar

11:30 — 13:00 **Seminar 3**
Workshop - WS07

Presentations:
Case-based approach for new and emerging issues in research ethics and integrity training
Kadri Simm, Mari-Liisa Parder, Heldi Marleen Lang, Emmi Jennina Kaaya

13:00 — 14:00

Lobby, Main Hall
Wednesday lunch and poster walk
Posters

Note that all posters will be on display throughout the duration of the Congress (Tuesday and Wednesday). For the list of posters, please see the Tuesday tracks Tuesday lunch and 2-min poster presentations (Track A) and Tuesday lunch and poster walk (Track B).

14:00 — 15:30

Main Hall
Power Dynamics 2
Chair: Dejan Jontes

Presentations:

14:00 — 14:15
Ethical implications of power dynamics in the recruitment of young people in school settings
Tamara Trošt

14:15 — 14:30
Authorship conflicts between supervisors and PhD students – Findings from a recent survey in Germany
Nele Reeg

14:30 — 14:45
Diversifying Philosophy with Methods from the Social Sciences
Dilara Diegelmann

14:45 — 15:00
Unequal Burdens: Power, Gender and the Impact of Covid-19 on Women in Academia
Giulia Inguaggiato, Claudia Pallise Perello, Petra Verdonk, Pamela Andanda, Mariette van den Hoven, Linda Schoonmade, Natalie Evans

15:00 — 15:15
Abuse of Power as Breach of Good Research Practice – Towards an Integration of Power Abusive Behaviors in Research Integrity Guidelines
Katharina Beier, Sophia May, Britta Anstötz, Valerie Boda, Maria Melms, Carmen Schüler

14:00 — 15:30

Seminar 1
Health Care
Chair: Ana Marušić

Presentations:

14:00 — 14:15
The LORIER program at Inserm: a tool for fostering a culture of ethical and responsible research in the health research community
Catherine Coirault, Boczkowski Jorge, Nathalie Théret, Ghislaine Filiatreau

14:15 — 14:30
The 3R Principles in laboratory animals experiments and the necessity of a fourth R
Ilja Richard Pavone

14:30 — 14:45
Ethical implications of using AI in healthcare research
Daniela Proske, Sandra Scholl, Dirk Lanzerath

14:45 — 15:00
Enhancing Research Integrity in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: Lessons from Global Initiatives in Oncology
Khalid El Bairi

15:00 — 15:15 **From the Margins to the Mainstream: Epistemic Injustice in Medical Crisis Decision-Making**
Mina Lahlal, Tobias Kerzenmacher

14:00 — 15:30 **Seminar 5**
Concepts and Definitions
Chair: Maura Hiney

Presentations:

14:00 — 14:15 **Towards a Common Definition of Research Integrity in ENRIO: Findings from a Normative Analysis**
Helene Ingierd

14:15 — 14:30 **In Quest of Conceptual Clarity: ENRIO Recommendations for Acceptable Practices for Authorship**
Loreta Tauginienė

14:30 — 14:45 **Normative Analysis of Research Integrity Concepts: What is the Difference Between Research Misconduct and Questionable Research Practices?**
Michaela Lenčéšová, Ana Marušić

14:45 — 15:00 **Towards a Fair Recognition of Research Performed by Members of Consortia - Approaching Challenges Observed in Germany**
Sophia May, Hjördis Czesnick

15:00 — 15:15 **What does fairness mean for RI and RCR codes?: A scoping review using Critical Discourse Analysis**
Claudia Pallise Perello, Natalie Evans, Marian Crespo Lopez, Mariette van den Hoven, Krishma Labib

14:00 — 15:30
Seminar 3

Seminar 3
Workshop - WS08

Presentations:
Enhancing Research Ethics Training in the Age of AI: Insights from a European Multi-Institutional Needs Assessment
Vasileios Stamatopoulos, Dimitris Kyriazanos, Effrosyni Mitsaina , Xenia Douka, Ana Marušić

14:00 — 15:30 **Seminar 4**
Workshop - WS09

Presentations:
Ethics at the Edge: Reimagining Integrity in Research Funding, Institutional Partnerships, and Academic Freedom
Mina Lahlal, Tobias Kerzenmacher

15:30 — 16:00 **Wednesday afternoon coffee break**

16:00 — 17:00

Main Hall
Concluding Plenary and Closing remarks
Power Dynamics: Carole Chapin
Training and Education: Ana Marušić
Trust in Science: Loreta Tauginiene

17:00 —17:30

Main Hall
Farewell

The ENRIO 2025 Congress in Ljubljana continued the series of biennial events addressing research integrity practice (RI) and the development of responsible research in Europe. The first ENRIO Congress, initiated by the former ENRIO Chair Sanna Kaisa Spoof (TENK, Finland), took place in Helsinki in 2021 and faced the unique challenge of being held in a hybrid format due to the pandemic. The 2nd ENRIO Congress (2023) was co-organized by OFIS and hosted by the Sorbonne University in Paris. While Ljubljana, and in particular the University of Ljubljana, was open to co-organize the 3rd ENRIO Congress. We were ultimately able to welcome over 250 participants, **from 35 countries across all continents**, to Ljubljana. The increased interest reflects a growing awareness of the relevance of research ethics and integrity, as well as the ever more significant role of ENRIO.

The ENRIO congresses on Research Integrity Practice are generally aimed at all experts in research integrity and research ethics, RI officers and practitioners, members of ethics and investigation committees, representatives of research funding organisations and sponsors, and all interested and involved in the enhancement and sustainable implementation of good RI practices and policies.

As the focus issues for ENRIO2025, we decided to emphasise **power dynamics** in research as well as institutional responsibility to **foster an open, safe, and inclusive research environment** as a foundation for RI in everyday practice. In a broader global context, this also implies the recognition of **fairness, equity and diversity** as essential components of RI, as outlined in the Cape Town Statement of 2022. We wanted to encourage interested colleagues to present challenges from different perspectives, as well as practical and emerging solutions in terms of prevention and awareness raising.

The contributions clearly demonstrate that these concepts and ideas received a strong response, producing high-quality and varied presentations. We were delighted to have received a total of **106 abstracts for oral presentations, posters, and workshops**. Additionally, the concept of offering a pre-conference day for satellite events and select **congress workshops** was also well received. A total of five satellite events were also held on 22nd September. A **round table discussion on the topic of "Tensions between ethics and law"** marked the informal beginning of the congress, the day before the official opening on 23rd September.

This Book of Abstracts includes contributions on the three keynote topics: **"Power Dynamics," "Trust in Science," and "Training and Education,"** as well as other contributions from the corresponding sessions. The wide range of topics was clearly reflected in the other various sessions: there were numerous contributions on **"AI and RI"** as well as on **"RI Governance"** and **"Research Culture"**. These highly practical sessions focused on **"Handling Cases"** and **"Health Care"**; other topics included **"Concepts and Definitions"**, **"Reports from Different Countries,"** and, of course, the ever-present topic of **"Publication and Authorship."** Furthermore, in a special session called an "Invited Session," different perspectives (approaches and experiences related to) on the topic of **"Empowerment in Response to Power Abuse"** were presented and discussed. The key outcomes of the congress, as presented through the lens of the keynote topics, are summarised in the concluding remarks.

We would be delighted if you could make use of this BoA in a variety of ways: to find out which presentations are most relevant to your own work, or to get an impression of which contributions you might have missed due to the numerous sessions running in parallel. Even if you were unable to attend the congress, you still have the opportunity to gain a broad overview of the content and potentially connect with colleagues to discuss topics of mutual interest.

Last but not least, we would like to express our sincere gratitude to everyone who contributed to making the ENRIO2025 Congress a successful and memorable event. Our thanks go to our hosts, the University of Ljubljana and the Faculty of Law; the members of the program and the local organizing committees; the session Chairs; the staff of the Antana PCO agency and all the local assistants; and, of course, the invited speakers, presenters and participants. Without whom, the program, the contents of which are reproduced in this book, would not have been possible.

By Helga Nolte and Urša Opara Krašovec

Prof. dr. Miro Cerar, Dean of the Faculty of Law, University of Ljubljana

Ladies and gentlemen, Dear colleagues, friends and guests,

It is an honour and a pleasure to welcome you to this year's ENRIO (European Network of Research Integrity Offices) Congress at the Faculty of Law of the University of Ljubljana. Our Faculty is the oldest, largest and most prestigious law faculty in Slovenia, where excellence and integrity in studies and research are strongly promoted.

I would like to express my gratitude to the University of Ljubljana, the coordinator of this congress, whose commitment, hospitality and tireless efforts have made this event possible. My sincere thanks also go to all the people involved in the organisation and to all the congress participants who have come here to reaffirm our common conviction: that integrity in research is not just a set of rules to be followed, but a foundation of trust without which science cannot flourish.

As a law professor who also deals with various ethical issues, I would like to briefly discuss the importance of ethics and law in the field of research. Both sets of norms and the values behind them are interdependent, but from an analytical perspective and in a simplified form, we can say that law, besides its specific values, mostly provides the structure of the desired research integrity — the formal boundaries of acceptable behaviour, while ethics… ethics gives it soul. Universal and professional ethics questions our value orientations more deeply and confronts us with the question of whether our research activities serve a meaningful and good purpose.

As so-called artificial intelligence expands exponentially, we cannot foresee all of its future effects on society and individuals. But as useful as it may be, AI must serve humanity and never generally overpower or replace it. This danger is already looming as AI is at a rudimentary stage of development. Researchers of all kinds therefore bear an enormous risk and responsibility in this respect. This is where law and ethics meet in two fundamental aspects. Science and all other social activities must be legally and ethically organised and protected in such a way that the human being remains the fundamental starting point and ultimate goal of law and ethics. In other words, despite all possible applications of AI and other scientific instruments, science must remain human and humane.

Of course, this cannot be guaranteed by law and ethics alone. The rational, emotional, social and other dimensions of human intelligence must be utilised to ensure human and humane science.

The famous Chinese thinker Lao Tzu said: "The more rules and regulations, the more thieves and robbers." If we grasp this freely translated thought with our hearts and not through analytical thinking, we can feel how it reflects our daily experience. For the world has never had as many ethical and legal rules as it has today, and yet it seems that our human virtues do not follow these rules and that greed, corruption, lying and other kinds of unethical and illegal behavior are still on the rise. This does not mean that ethical and legal principles and rules are meaningless or useless. They are very important. However, they cannot be effective if they are not supported by an appropriately developed ethical, legal and political culture.

If we connect this idea with research integrity, we can see that research integrity is not a checklist at its core — it is a culture. It requires vigilance, humility, knowledge, multidimensional intelligence and a shared commitment from all of us. It is a complex endeavor that spans scientific disciplines, institutions and different countries, and cannot be achieved by rules alone. The responsibility lies first and foremost with the scientific community itself: To uphold standards, educate the next generation, and create an environment where honesty and rigour are not only expected, but celebrated.

With this in mind, I am pleased that the University of Ljubljana has introduced several mechanisms to promote and protect the integrity of research. In particular, it protects those who dare to expose unethical or illegal behavior or practices and provides a network of trusted individuals who offer support to anyone who is exposed to or witnesses unethical or illegal

pressure. Such mechanisms not only help to address misconduct, but also foster an environment of openness and accountability.

Dear colleagues, honored guests, dear friends,

Sometimes integrity is about big decisions. But even more often, it's about small moments — choosing transparency over convenience, courage over silence and truth over pride.

I am convinced that this congress will not only serve as an exchange of ideas, but will also strengthen our common mission: to build a research culture in which integrity is not only preserved, but deeply rooted — and in which every member of the community feels both empowered and responsible to protect it.

Once again, I welcome you and wish you all a meaningful and productive Congress.

Thank you.

Bert Seghers, President of the ENRIO

Dear targets of power abuse, dear targets of whistle-blower retaliation

Dear Rector, dean, and representatives of the European Commission

Dear research integrity professionals and researchers from across Europe, dear friends

1 Power abuse

Research integrity is the cornerstone of good science. And you can't do good science when you don't feel good. Two oneliners, which link the field we're working in to safe research culture, the theme of the conference. We all know the stories and testimonies about some academics, from the painful remarks meant as a joke, to outright bullying or sexual harassment. Just like research misconduct in a strict sense, this is a matter of culture. It's not only about individual deviant pathologies, but more about what we as academics expect from each other, and feel confident to address each other about. Academia does not have a culture where it is easy to discuss behaviour. I'm really glad that Helga Nolte, Urša Opara Krašovec and the other members of the programme committee of the conference have chosen safe academic culture as the main theme.

I hope this congress will bring new bonds and alliances to improve academic culture. Let's not forget: it's both for the good of science, and for the wellbeing of people.

2 Academic freedom

Talking about good science in 2025, it's impossible not to mention academic freedom. We all see worrying developments in many parts of the world. In the nineties, science got aware that we had to protect research from individual misconduct. In the last decade, we geared up in protecting research from organised crime, now on steroids with AI-power — think of predatory journals and paper mills. But now the next conundrum could be how to protect science from national governments — yes, even democratically chosen governments. And not only foreign governments (research security) but also domestic governments. Europe is not immune to this threat, that has already started emerging in EU countries. How can European science be resilient to future attacks on science? How can we avoid stories of misconduct or power abuse being weaponised against science? I think we, as research integrity professionals, might have a very relevant role to play in the future. I call on each of you to think and wonder: what can we do, as the research integrity field? Protecting our science will be vital, not only for the good of our knowledge societies, as a goal in itself. Protecting our science is protecting Europe's competitiveness.

Before the summer, ENRIO took the initiative to publish a statement, which articulated and defended the link between research integrity and academic freedom, and their importance. Academic freedom creates the conditions for researchers to act with integrity, freely choose their questions and report results honestly. Pressure on academic freedom puts pressure on research integrity, not because scientists are weak, but they might self-censor as a survival strategy or to secure funds. On the other side of the social contract between science and society, the framework of research integrity shapes conditions for academic freedom: the professional standards in place justify public trust in science and hence academic freedom.

3 ENRIO

Academic freedom and safe academic culture are only two of many relevant topics connected to research integrity. As national bodies for research integrity and expert contributors, we, members of ENRIO, follow such themes and trends, in order to understand them and perhaps impact them in a positive way. ENRIO started back in 2007-2008, when some people working in research integrity organisations met at the first World Conference on Research Integrity in Lisbon. They

noticed that their organisations were similar and they had similar challenges, yet they didn't know each other. That informal gathering back then was followed by others, eventually becoming regular, with more organisations sending representatives. It grew and developed until ENRIO today. Almost 20 years after the initial meeting, ENRIO has now become a legal entity, a non-profit association located in Belgium, and an employer to staff.

We have developed a long-term strategy for ENRIO, pending adoption by our members later this week. We provide the research integrity professional community with practical resources like Handbooks, country reports and short statements, informed by our members. And we try to convene the research integrity professional community in years without a World Conference. So just like the World and European football championships alternate, this Congress happens about halfway between the World Conferences of Athens last year and Vancouver next year. We have the ambition to do more, to be a leading voice on research integrity, and influence the policy field. But at our core, we are still the same group of friends. We come together twice a year to discuss national and international developments and share experiences. We advise each other and also other countries where the attention to research integrity still has to develop.

Ladies and gentlemen, what the world of research and of research integrity looks like, is determined — to a large extent — by the research community itself. It's us. With ENRIO, we are committed to help shape this future.

I wish you a fruitful congress!

Prof. dr. Gregor Majdič, Rector of the University of Ljubljana

It is my great pleasure to warmly welcome you, on behalf of the University of Ljubljana, to our small but beautiful city.

First, I would like to sincerely thank the organizers for their outstanding work in preparing this congress.

Today, research integrity is a crucial issue. In the so-called post-truth era, when personal opinions often seem to outweigh scientific facts, we are witnessing a decline in public trust in science. There are many reasons for this. Like many others, I often point to social media, but another significant factor is the rise in research misconduct. In 2023 alone, more than 10,000 scientific papers were retracted—the highest number ever recorded—which illustrates the scale of the problem.

Addressing this challenge is not easy. We once hoped that open science would provide a solution. While open science still holds great promise and remains essential, it too requires substantial reform. Large private publishers have capitalized on it for profit, and many new publishers that seized the opportunity of open-science initiatives are more interested in revenue than in upholding scientific integrity. This has only exacerbated the problem, with thousands of papers retracted—and likely many more fraudulent ones that remain undetected.

At the University of Ljubljana, we take this issue very seriously. We are founding members of CoARA—the Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment—and during my first term as rector, we introduced a new system of qualitative research assessment. This was not easy, as many are accustomed to the traditional system of simply counting publications. Yet the "publish or perish" culture is, in my opinion, a major driver of integrity problems. When the system pressures researchers to publish endlessly and rewards them based on quantity rather than quality, it inevitably tempts some to take shortcuts that undermine integrity.

I believe there is a way forward, though it will not be simple. Last year, we established an Office for Research Integrity at the University of Ljubljana, and I hope other institutions in Slovenia will follow our example. We all must be open about research integrity if we want to achieve real change. We scientists must reclaim the realm of scientific publishing, and only we can rebuild public trust in science—by discussing issues of integrity honestly and openly.

Before I conclude, let me briefly touch on another pressing issue: artificial intelligence. AI is becoming an important part of our everyday lives, and in the context of this congress, it is relevant from at least two perspectives.

First, how we use AI in research and in writing scientific papers. I see no problem in using AI to help draft an introduction or process data, but we must always be cautious when using these tools. They should assist us in our work—not do the work for us. These tools can be biased and are prone to "hallucinations." We should not reject them—they are becoming an integral part of our lives and will only grow in importance—but we must learn to use them responsibly.

Second, we must consider how AI itself is developed and how it learns. The ancient Greek philosophers already distinguished between doxa (opinion) and episteme (knowledge)—a distinction that remains as important today as ever. The challenge for AI lies in how and from what it learns. If we want AI tools that are truly helpful and beneficial, they must be based on episteme—knowledge—rather than doxa—personal opinion. If we feed AI with personal opinions, it will mirror our biases and fail to serve as a reliable assistant.

This is a real danger today. A few months ago, the U.S. National Institute of Standards was instructed by the governemnt not to restrict what goes into AI systems, suggesting that everything available should be used. This, of course, is risky. That is why I believe academic institutions must play a central role in AI development. At present, development is largely in the hands of powerful international corporations. But academia must fight for its place, because

only scholars can ensure that these tools are developed to benefit humanity—rather than deepen polarization, ignorance, and distrust in science.

I wish you a very successful congress. I am delighted that it is taking place here in Ljubljana, and I warmly welcome you to Slovenia.

Round table-discussion: “Tensions between Ethics and Law”

The central theme of the discussion revolved around tensions between ethics and law. These tensions become particularly pronounced when legal compliance may compromise ethical standards or when ethical imperatives encourage actions that potentially challenge legal boundaries, requiring researchers to engage in complex decision-making processes that balance adherence to regulatory frameworks with commitment to fundamental ethical principles that underpin scientific progress.

Tensions between Ethics and Law

Teodora Konach[1], Asaël Rouby[2], Jörgen Svidén[3], Loreta Tauginienė[4]

[1] European Association of Research Managers and Administrators, Austria

[2] LARI, Fonds national de la Recherche, Luxemburg

[3] The Ethics Review Appeals Board, Sweden

[4] Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania

Tensions between ethics and law become particularly pronounced when legal compliance may compromise ethical standards or when ethical imperatives encourage actions that potentially challenge legal boundaries, requiring researchers to engage in complex decision-making processes that balance adherence to regulatory frameworks with commitment to fundamental ethical and research integrity principles that underpin research practice.

There is an ongoing discussion within the research community based on concerns that research ethics has become too legalistic and that it is becoming increasingly so; a kind of juridification of ethics. If research ethics is becoming more formalized, is this not something we should be happy about? Is it not in fact a good thing that we have uniform and thus legally secure and predictable systems for research ethical rules?

Maintaining research integrity requires alignment between ethical norms, research integrity principles, and legal frameworks. Research performing and funding organizations should clearly separate authorship (scholarly accountability) from ownership (rights), ensure transparent contributorship, and prohibit ghost-writing (e.g. contract cheating, paper mills). Human authors must remain responsible for artificial intelligence (AI) tool use, be transparent while disclosing its usage, and verify sources, and practices aligned with the Bern Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (WIPO, 1886), the EU Directive (2019) on copyright and related rights in the Digital Single Market (EU, 2019), Artificial Intelligence Act (EU, 2024), national copyright laws, and other relevant documents and guidelines from the European Union (EU) or research funding organizations. For example, with the adoption of AI tools, individual responsibility must remain with natural persons, so-named human authors. However, in ethical terms, authorship might be attributed to institutions or research project consortiums.

Researchers must follow a large number of ethical principles and guidelines (e.g. by research performing and/or funding organizations, journals), some of which are codified in law in some ENRIO countries, while most are not. In ethical terms, good research practice primarily addresses such issues as falsification, fabrication, and plagiarism. Also, there are numerous rules regarding deviations from good research practice, such as the relationship between researchers, supervisors, and doctoral candidates, authorship, translations, citation, misuse of AI, hindering scientific review, misrepresentation of merits, and so forth. Given the growing number of authorship violations, should the improper use of authorship be considered an extension of these concerns? What is the most appropriate approach for addressing this issue—an ethical one or a legal one? These questions have potential to increase in number over time.

The ethical rules can be found in a variety of national or EU ethical documents and codes. Some of the research ethical guidelines are sometimes highlighted as authorities, but there is no basis for this other than that certain such documents have historically come to have an important impact on the development of research ethics and integrity, e.g. the Nuremberg Code (1947), the Helsinki Declaration (WMA, 1964), and the revised European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (ALLEA, 2023; first published in 2011). The majority of research performing and funding organizations maintain their own established policies, guidelines, or regulations. Different research disciplines and international collaborations each have their own rules, among many other considerations. In this context, it is to note that although the university autonomy

and academic freedom of researchers stand in contrast to the introduction of national ethical regulations, researchers should adhere to both ethical and legal rules (e.g. criminal laws, data protection regulations, such as GDPR in the EU). This is not questioned. Why question equal treatment also of commonly accepted ethical regulations?

Researchers must follow ethical, scientific, and legal rules, which often overlap but can differ. The purpose of having the same rules apply to everyone mainly revolves around the idea of equality before the law, so and ethics, and that the rules, along with their sanctions, should be predictable. Legal rules – laws, regulations – represent a codification of ethical norms with the aim of achieving predictability and equal treatment. Nevertheless, what differs is the consequence for breaking any of the rules (e.g. Hosseini et al., 2022).

To support trustworthy research practice, research performing and funding organizations could prioritise disclosure-based governance over reliance on automated detection, implement contribution and data-provenance audits, and segregate research-only pipelines from any subsequent commercialization with appropriate rights clearance. As regulatory and technological contexts continue to evolve, policies, training, and review mechanisms should be regularly updated with input from professional communities (e.g. ENRIO, EARMA, Science Europe). The overarching objective is to ensure sustained alignment between ethical research practice with legal enforceability, thereby facilitating responsible and transparent innovation for researchers as well as research performing and funding organizations. This integrated approach supports the research community's credibility, reliability, and adaptability to emerging challenges.

References

ALLEA (2023). The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. https://allea.org/code-of-conduct/

EU (2019). Directive (EU) 2019/790 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2019 on copyright and related rights in the Digital Single Market and amending Directives 96/9/EC and 2001/29/EC. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2019/790/oj/eng

EU (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence and amending Regulations (EC) No 300/2008, (EU) No 167/2013, (EU) No 168/2013, (EU) 2018/858, (EU) 2018/1139 and (EU) 2019/2144 and Directives 2014/90/EU, (EU) 2016/797 and (EU) 2020/1828 (Artificial Intelligence Act). https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj/eng

Hosseini, M., Lewis, J., Zwart, H., & Gordijn, B. (2022). An Ethical Exploration of Increased Average Number of Authors Per Publication. Science and Engineering Ethics, 28, 25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-021-00352-3

The Nuremberg Code (1947). https://media.tghn.org/medialibrary/2011/04/BMJ_No_7070_Volume_313_The_Nuremberg_Code.pdf

WIPO (1886). Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works. https://www.wipo.int/treaties/en/ip/berne/

WMA (1964). Declaration of Helsinki – Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Participants. https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki/

Ethical considerations vs legal requirements: 6 case studies at the intersection of Intellectual Property Rights and research ethics and intergity

Theodora Konach, European Association of Research Managers and Administrators, Austria

As research practices evolve through digitalisation, collaboration, and AI integration, maintaining integrity increasingly requires coherence between ethical, legal, and technological systems. Upholding responsible research conduct demands more than formal compliance – it calls for systematic alignment between research ethics principles, research integrity guidelines, and legal rights frameworks.

Institutions should establish clear distinctions between authorship, which reflects intellectual accountability for scholarly contributions, and ownership, which derives from copyright or contractual rights. Transparent contributorship mechanisms should be embedded in institutional policies, with guidance and training ensuring that authorship decisions are based on substantive intellectual input rather than position or resource provision.

With the growing adoption of AI tools in research and publishing, responsibility must always remain with named human authors. AI use should be clearly disclosed, sources independently verified, and practices aligned with the legal boundary between ideas and expression as well as with the EU Directive (2019/790) on Copyright in the Digital Single Market and the transparency requirements introduced by the AI Act. While AI-assisted works can be protected where human creativity is evident, purely machine-generated material cannot.

In relation to data governance, the EU's text and data mining (TDM) exceptions under the DSM Directive allow research use while preserving rightholder control and requiring transparency. Institutions should maintain dataset registers, separate research-only and commercial workflows, and ensure rights are re-cleared when research outputs move toward market application.

To ensure trustworthy practice, organisations should prioritise disclosure-based governance over automated detection systems, implement contribution and data-provenance audits, and keep policies and training under continuous review in collaboration with professional communities such as EARMA. The overarching objective is to achieve lasting alignment between ethical integrity and legal enforceability – supporting responsible, transparent, and innovative research across the European Research Area.

Ethical vs. Legal Challenges in Research – FNR Perspective

Asaël Rouby, LARI, Fonds national de la Recherche, Luxemburg

This FNR presentation at the ENRIO 2025 conference explored the nuanced relationship between ethical considerations and legal requirements in contemporary research, drawing on real-world case studies from the Luxembourg National Research Fund (FNR). The session aimed to foster an open dialogue among research integrity professionals, funders, and researchers about the practical dilemmas encountered in the field.

Through five illustrative cases, the discussion highlighted how legal compliance—such as adherence to GDPR, copyright law, and regulations on genetic editing—often intersected with deeper ethical questions. For example, researchers faced conflicts between protecting personal data and maximising public health benefits, or between the legal permissibility of AI surveillance technologies and the ethical imperative to safeguard civil liberties. The presentation also addressed the tension between open access and copyright, and the challenge of balancing transparency with confidentiality in Data Management Plans.

FNR's approach emphasised that integrity in research was not limited to rule-following; it required ongoing ethical reflection and responsible decision-making. The funder's role included providing guidance on anonymisation, requiring robust Data Management Plans, and mandating ethical risk assessments for sensitive projects. FNR also maintained open access and ensured that projects involving genome editing or surveillance underwent rigorous ethical scrutiny.

The session invited participants to consider how institutions could best support researchers in navigating these evolving challenges. It showcased FNR's initiatives—such as narrative CVs, mentorship awards, and participation in international working groups—as examples of fostering a culture of integrity and transparency. The establishment of the Luxembourg Agency for Research Integrity (LARI) further demonstrated Luxembourg's commitment to responsible research.

Participants were encouraged to share experiences, strategies, and questions about reconciling legal and ethical demands in their own contexts. The discussion underscored the importance of regular reassessment as technology and societal expectations evolved, and the vital role of forward-thinking institutions in promoting responsible innovation.

By engaging with these case studies and institutional practices, the session aimed to advance the collective understanding of research integrity, inspire practical solutions, and strengthen the European research community's commitment to ethical excellence.

Ethical vs. Legal Challenges in Research - There is no contradiction between ethics and law

Jörgen Svidén, The Ethics Review Appeals Board, Sweden

There is an ongoing discussion within the research community based on a fear that research ethics has become too legalistic and that it is becoming increasingly so; a kind of juridification of ethics. The discussion is particularly common in social science and humanities research. If research ethics is becoming more formalized, is this not something we should be happy about? Is it not in fact a good thing that we have uniform and thus legally secure and predictable systems for research ethical rules?

Researchers must follow a large number of ethical principles and guidelines, some of which are codified in law in some countries, while most are not. Good research practice primarily includes FFP (falsification, fabrication, plagiarism). In addition, there are numerous rules regarding deviations from good research practice; the relationship between researchers, supervisors, and doctoral candidates, authorship, translations, citation, misuse of AI, hindering scientific review, misrepresentation of merits, etc. The list can be made much, much longer.

These ethical rules can be found in a variety of ethical documents and codes; perhaps the most prominent being ALLEA's Code of Conduct. Most educational institutions also have their own regulations, different research disciplines have their rules, journals have their regulations, and the list can go on much longer. It can be noted that there are plenty of ethical rules for researchers to adhere to, and although many are similar, they often vary. What differs even more is the consequence for breaking any of the rules.

Some of the research ethical guidelines are sometimes highlighted as authorities, but there is no basis for this other than that certain such documents have historically come to have an important impact on the development of research ethics, e.g. the Helsinki Declaration and the Nurnberg Code. That a certain guideline or code expresses an opinion is not the same as it being either correct, well-argued, or even a majority opinion – it is merely evidence that the opinion exists.

The purpose of having the same rules apply to everyone mainly revolves around the idea of equality before the law, and that the rules, along with their sanctions, should be predictable. There may be a contradiction between law and ethics, but it shouldn't be the case: Law is indeed ethics! Legal rules – laws, regulations – represent a codification of ethical rules with the aim of achieving predictability and equal treatment.

And it is often claimed that the autonomy of our universities stands in contrast to the introduction of national ethical regulations. The autonomy of higher education institutions is of course extremely important and something that should not be compromised when it comes to, for instance, political governance and determining education. However, higher education institutions and their staff, the researchers, have to follow a number of legal regulations that are the same for everyone: criminal laws, GDPR, etc. This is not questioned. Why question equal treatment also of commonly accepted ethical regulations?

Leadership, Courage, and Responsibility: Addressing Gender-Based Violence as a Matter of Research Integrity

Marcela Linkova

Institute of Sociology, Czech Academy of Sciences, Czech Republic

Gender-based violence in research and academia is not only a violation of human rights—it is also a fundamental breach of research integrity. It undermines the principles of fairness, safety, accountability, and trust that are essential to responsible research environments. Yet institutional responses to gender-based violence often fall short, particularly when they prioritise reputation management over justice, fail to act on reports, or disregard the needs of those affected. These failures constitute what scholars have termed institutional betrayal—the harm that institutions inflict when they fail to protect those who depend on them.

This presentation addresses institutional responsibility for tackling gender-based violence within the framework of research integrity, drawing on insights from the Horizon Europe project GenderSAFE. The project's findings reveal the systemic and multi-level nature of institutional failures in addressing gender-based violence, including the absence of transparent procedures, weak accountability mechanisms, and a lack of protection from retaliation. Such shortcomings not only harm individuals, particularly those from minoritised groups, but also perpetuate unsafe and unequal research environments. To move forward, institutions need more than formal policies—they need institutional courage: the proactive commitment to confront harm, support those affected, and uphold the values they profess. This requires strong, ethical leadership and a shift in institutional cultures toward accountability, care, and equity. In this context, research integrity officers and practitioners have a key role to play, even if gender-based violence may not yet be seen as part of their remit. The keynote will explore how their role could evolve in relation to institutional efforts on gender-based violence, and how these efforts intersect with broader integrity challenges, including whistleblower protection, academic freedom, and non-discrimination.

The presentation will offer a constructive reflection on the barriers and opportunities for embedding gender-based violence prevention and response into institutional research integrity frameworks. It will propose key principles and practical actions for institutions seeking to align their values with practice, anchored in transparency, inclusivity, and the voices of those most affected.

Ultimately, fostering research integrity requires more than compliance: it requires courage, responsibility, and leadership at all levels.

Science under siege: Anti-gender mobilizations and the struggle over epistemic power

Roman Kuhar

University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts, Slovenia

In recent years, academic institutions have increasingly come under attack – politically, ideologically, and economically. While concerns over academic freedom are not new, we are now witnessing a global intensification of pressure on science and scholarship, particularly in fields that challenge traditional hierarchies and power relations. Gender appears to be at the center of these attacks, but they also target other issues connected to diversity, minorities, discrimination, and social justice more broadly. These areas of research are routinely dismissed as ideological, subversive, or unscientific. Individual scholars are being harassed, surveilled, or silenced through online campaigns, institutional complaints, or even legal threats. But the deeper issue at stake is not only what is being researched, but who holds the authority to define legitimate knowledge.

Across different contexts, we observe systematic efforts to restrict academic freedom: from presidential decrees in the United States aimed at banning certain terms and concepts in research, to the outright prohibition of gender studies programs in Hungary – and similar pressures exist elsewhere. These are not isolated incidents. Rather, they are rooted in the broader ideological framework of the so-called anti-gender mobilizations. These are not simply reactions to progressive social change; they are proactive and organized efforts to delegitimize academic work that exposes and critiques systems of oppression – whether related to gender, race, sexuality, or other axes of inequality. In this sense anti-gender mobilizations do not represent only political mobilizations, but also struggles not over epistemic power – the authority to determine what counts as knowledge, who is allowed to produce it, and whose perspectives are deemed valid.

This keynote will unpack the genealogy of these mobilizations, tracing their origins, key actors, and discursive strategies. It will also reflect on how universities and research communities can – and should – respond. At stake is not only the protection of academic freedom, but the democratic potential of science itself: its ability to reflect, to question, and to imagine alternatives to existing structures of power. In a time of rising authoritarianism and deepening epistemic polarization, defending this potential has never been more urgent.

Power and empowerment in RCR training

Mariette van den Hoven

Amsterdam UMC, Netherlands

In the past decade, the field of training and education in research integrity has developed impressively. Not only is there an increase in mandatory trainings (1), but numerous training templates have been developed and offered to the teaching community (6). One important reason to offer training is to change research practices within the academy (2). It is attempted to create a more open and transparent academic community, that is driven by high quality standards and attitudes of accountability, honesty and impartiality, instead of a community driven by publication pressure, sloppy science and questionable research practices. Changing research practices is, however, a long-term investment, as in many countries it is mostly early career researchers that are targeted with training in responsible conduct of research. This often leaves untouched practices of lousy or even harmful supervision untouched as newcomers to the field do not always (feel to) have a say in the organization. It also leaves untouched the power dynamics that are inherent to many research practices that are even harmful to the well-being of PhD candidates and leads to negative research cultures, even stimulating PhD's to leave the academia (3). Taking an empowerment perspective can help to both highlight the inherent power structures in academia as well as show how empowerment is needed at different layers in organisations, both at individual, group levels and systemic levels as well as that it addresses young researchers as well as more senior researchers (4,5). Empowerment is needed for all in the academia.

(1) Hoven, M. V., Asaduzzaman, M., Evans, • Natalie, Ike, • Chiedozie, Kalichman, M., Kniffert, S., Löfström, E., Van Loon, M., Moran, R., Nilsonne, G., Van Der Schot, D., Van 'T Veer, A. E., & Priess-Buchheit, J. (2023). Seven challenges for research integrity education: Current status and recommendations. (preprint) https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/5w9kg (2) B. A. Nosek et al. Promoting an open research culture.Science348,1422-1425(2015).DOI:10.1126/science.aab2374 (3) Kis, A., Tur, E.M., Lakens, D., Vaesen, K, Houkes, W. (2022). Leaving academia: PhD attrition and unhealthy research environments, PlosOne https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0274976 (4) Van Loon, M., Tijdkink, J., Evans, N., vd Hoven, M. (2025). Leading by example: how to empower supervisors as role models. Front. Res. Metr. Anal., 04 April 2025 Sec. Research Assessment. Volume 10 - 2025 https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2025.1533630 (5) Van Den Hoven, M., and Theunissen, B. (2021). Taking RCR seriously in teaching scientific integrity. Bioethica Forum 14, 89–93. doi: 10.24894/BF.2021.14010 (6) Embassy of Good Science: https://embassy.science/wiki/Main_Page (accessed May 7, 2025)

Training ethical researchers and creating a culture of integrity, wishful thinking or achievable goals?

Mohammad Hosseini

Northwestern University , United States

Research integrity and responsible conduct of research trainings are formal opportunities to raise and discuss research ethics and integrity topics with researchers. These trainings are expected to equip researchers with skills to conduct their research selflessly for the higher good, become better advocates for their communities and ultimately enhance the public trust in science. When emphasizing integrity in science and scholarship, we essentially demand researchers to always go the extra mile, make themselves vulnerable by being open and honest, respect and give the benefit of the doubt to colleagues and think proactively about possible harms to science and society. And this is all on top of the self-evident asks: conduct creative and original research, compete for grants and follow field-specific trends and also maintain a healthy work-life balance. This is a tall order, and let's not forget, all of this is demanded in inherently unequal environments with legacy hierarchies and power dynamics which may sometimes create complicated scenarios.

My main argument in this talk is that research integrity trainings are exploding with content touched at a surface level, and yet, in recent years, these short (and sometimes elective) trainings have created unreasonable expectations. In the best-case scenario, researchers who have attended a single course or training may learn, for example, what the ICMJE definition of authorship is, what open science entails or what constitutes misconduct, but can this knowledge be useful in practice and help them make the right decision when they face an ethical dilemma? Can they even recognize that they are facing an ethical dilemma? In fact, is it reasonable at all to expect them to know all of this? Beyond the expectations at an individual level, a "culture of integrity" is supposed to describe how larger (be it homogenous or heterogeneous) groups conduct their research. While this is an ambiguous concept in dire need of disentanglement, using it in a nonchalant manner by administrators and research integrity experts suggests a deterministic attitude towards researchers that may not always be helpful.

Thanks to champions who advocated for research integrity to become part and parcel of many curriculums and syllabi's, we have come a long way, but we can and should do more to promote research integrity. Thinking more pragmatically about research, and considering research integrity education as a continuous process are among solutions.

The Role of Institutions in Cultivating Trust in Science: A Qualitative Inquiry across Europe

Michel Dubois

CNRS - Sorbonne University, France

While much attention has been paid to how the general public expresses varying levels of trust in science, less is known about how European institutional stakeholders—within research-performing or research-funding organizations—perceive the public, and how they believe they can help foster public trust in science. In what ways do they understand research integrity and social inclusion as interconnected factors that shape trust? In this talk, Michel Dubois will present key findings from a qualitative sociological study carried out in seven European countries between 2022 and 2025.

Trust in Science and Technocracy Tolerance - two sides of the same coin?

Martin W. Bauer

London School of Economics and Political Science, United Kingdom

There is evidence for a wide-spread discourse of declining trust, but little evidence for an actual decline in trust in science, to the contrary, there might be in many places an increase of trust in science. I will re-frame the question of trust: can there be too much trust? And illustrate the answer with our attempt to measure 'technocracy tolerance']TT] with Eurobarometer data (EB 2021 and 2025). High levels of trust express a deference to scientific authority, which could morph into a desire to confer legitimacy to actual governance by scientific-technical elites. Technocracy is in tension with democracy; and technocratic elites expect trust from a disenfranchised public who admires them for past achievements or out of need in an emergency. There is little evidence of an immediate technocratic takeover; however, there is historical evidence for a perennial temptation among scientific-technical elites to govern 'technocratically', and what is variable is whether they get away with it. Might a wide-spread discourse of declining trust, when actual trust is stable, express a latent desire or ambition for technocratic governance? and might public opinion support such an ambition? To construct a portable measure of 'technocracy tolerance' in public opinion remains unfinished business of global efforts to measure attitudes to science which started on a large scale in the 1970s not least with the help of Eurobarometer.

Invited Session: “Empowerment in Response to Abuse of Power”

An open, safe, and inclusive research environment provides the foundation for research integrity (RI) in everyday practice. In a broader context, this also means recognizing fairness, equality, and diversity as essential components of RI that must be woven into organizational systems. Particularly in academic and research environments with a strong hierarchical structure, abuse of power presents an underlying problem that organizations often fail to acknowledge. Even fewer organizations implement measures to raise awareness about and prevent abuse of power, even though such measures are the only means of effectively protecting victims of such abuse when concrete cases emerge.

Empowerment is the antidote to abuse of power. Empowerment strengthens those affected, helping them to regain their voice and raise it against such abuse, to speak openly about the facts and stand up for the truth. It is also about joining forces with others, creating solidarity so that no one can be silently stripped of their dignity. We will explore ways to empower, particularly those most vulnerable in the research environment, encouraging the transformation of power from a tool of domination into a catalyst for individual and collective growth that enables science, and everyone, to thrive.

Empowerment in Response to Abuse of Power

Zoë Hammatt[1], Helga Nolte[2] and Urša Opara Krašovec[3]

[1] Research Integrity Consultation & Writing Services, USA and University of Hawaii, John A. Burns School of Medicine, USA

[2] Team Scientific Integrity, Germany

[3] University of Ljubljana, Faculty of electrical engineering, Slovenia

As part of the overarching theme of power dynamics, this session elucidated three distinct approaches to empowering those who face power abuses in the research environment. While recognising that power imbalances and hierarchical structures are inherent to research systems as a whole, each of the speakers touched upon key messages critical to creating an environment conducive not only to "success" within established systems but also to individual wellbeing and societal justice.

Rosemarie Bernabe provided poignant examples of societal expectations imposed upon those coming from "outside" the typical research environment, including women, particularly women of color, that amplify the pressures already imposed within the research setting. Speaking from personal experiences of her own as well as those of her diverse research team, she advocated for safety and inclusion, transparency and fairness, and, perhaps above all, a sense of belonging that helps engender trust, responsibility and growth.

As a form of empowerment, **Nicole Foeger** emphasised the need to set boundaries, reclaim one's own power, and seek allies as an alternative to fear and silence. From her many years of experience as a Research Integrity and Research Ethics Advisor and more recently as an Empowerment Coach, she highlighted the importance of collaboration among all involved in the research enterprise, with a keen eye toward wellbeing and support for those who face greater vulnerabilities.

Jean-Pascal van Ypersele demonstrated his courage by standing up as a whistleblower. He described his experience confronting harassment and abuse of power in academia, speaking on behalf of others whose voices would otherwise not have been heard. As a revered scientist and high-level administrator, Prof. van Ypersele used his credibility and authority to speak truth to power, not only on behalf of justice, but also on behalf of others who may have been more vulnerable in the face of hierarchical structures and longstanding silence in the face of injustice.

Discussion among the audience revealed additional emphasis upon existing resources and gaps within the system. Resources include the ENRIO Handbook on Whistleblower Protection in Research (2023) and the Alliance for Equality in Academia (info@allianceforequalityinacademia.eu), while gaps include the absence of "abuse of power" from the list of violations of research integrity in the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (2023) and the lack of awareness of such abuses at the level of institutional leadership.

In sum, the session served as a call to action. Each of the speakers advocated for individuals, groups, and leaders involved in the research endeavour to bravely stand up against abuse of power, to come together in strengthening systems for reporting and addressing violations of abuse of power, and to create an environment conducive to success and justice, for all.

EmPOWERment

Nicole Foeger, Research Integrity and Research Ethics Advisor, Empowerment Coach

Individuals employed in academic settings who have experienced power abuse sometimes report feeling overwhelmed by their circumstances but consider continuing to tolerate the situation for an extended period. This reaction is generally not recommended, as unresolved issues tend to come back until effectively addressed, for instance, if boundaries are not established, others may continue to violate them.

When people are faced with conflicts, they should definitely seek support from a friend, colleague, or another trusted person like an ombudsperson. Discussing the circumstances with someone else can help in evaluating the situation objectively, as the listener may provide insights without becoming emotionally involved. If the conflict has already escalated, it is advisable to have important discussions with a witness present, such as a confidential advisor or an ombudsperson. In difficult or seemingly hopeless situations it is in any case wise to seek support from others rather than acting alone.

Always look for allies and be sure you are never alone!

Fear is a bad companion and can hinder clear judgment, making it difficult to identify potential solutions during challenging situations or conflicts. However, there are always alternative courses of action to consider.

Remaining focused on the primary objective is key: There is a difference in saying “this person should no longer have any power” or “this person should no longer have any power over me”. The emphasis should be on personal well-being rather than seeking retribution.

Academic settings are often characterized by hierarchical structures, significant pressure, and competitive behavior. Fostering a culture that emphasizes advocacy for colleagues, constructive feedback and support for individuals who may be more vulnerable contributes to a positive change within academia and ultimately encourages early-career researchers to remain in the field. In all cases of power abuse and escalating conflicts it becomes evident that without collaboration of all key players including institutions we mostly fail all together.

Don’t give anyone the power to victimize you!

My Role as the Group Leader of Superwomen (and men) doing Research Ethics and Research Integrity

Rosemarie Bernabe, PhD, Centre for Medical Ethics, University of Oslo

This presentation reflects on my experience as the group leader of a highly international research ethics and research integrity group at the University of Oslo, composed of researchers and PhD fellows from Kenya, Cameroon, Jamaica, Nepal, Rwanda, India, Ethiopia, and Canada. This group consists of mostly of researchers whose career paths have been paved with several layers of obstacles, navigating unequal power structures, subtle and overt exclusion, precarity, and the constant reminder of perceived "outsider" status encapsulated in the recurring question, "When are you going to go home?" For many of these researchers, the journey into academia required first breaking gendered, racialised, and geopolitical barriers long before facing the demands of research.

Drawing on our experiences and the testimonies from group members, I explore what enables thriving in environments where power, which, to cite Foucault, is not only repressive but also reproductive, can marginalize as much as it governs. Empowerment, for us, has a clearly structural element: safety and inclusion are preconditions to participation; transparency and fairness to counter arbitrariness; voice coupled with agency and not just token consultation; trust built through accountable leadership; and the belongingness in a community as protection against isolation. Crucially, empowerment also means entrusting real responsibility and enabling growth.

My experience leading this group of "superwomen and men" highlights the environmental aspect of research integrity, i.e., that research integrity is inseparable from the conditions under which researchers live, work, and aspire. The cultivation of belonging, equity of voice, shared agency, and an environment where human beings are allowed to make mistakes and feel safe are necessary factors for researchers to flourish, to tap into their transformative abilities and passions as researchers.

Confronting abuse of power: My experience as a whistleblower about harassment at the UCLouvain university (Belgium)

Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Prof. emeritus, UCLouvain (Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium); former Vice-Chair of the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), co-founder of the Alliance for Equality in Academia

In this presentation, I shared my personal journey as a whistleblower confronting harassment and abuse of power within academia, focusing on my experience at UCLouvain in Belgium. As a long-time climate scientist and former Vice-Chair of the IPCC, I am familiar with the necessity of speaking truth to power—whether in climate negotiations against the influence of fossil fuel lobbies, or within universities facing entrenched patriarchal structures. I drew parallels between climate action and academic integrity: just as societies must address existing climate damage through adaptation and prevent further harm through mitigation, universities must both repair harm to victims of harassment and implement preventive cultural and regulatory changes, guided by a "harasser pays" principle like the "polluter pays" one.

My involvement began in 2021, when two female colleagues were excluded from their research group after resisting harassment and requesting fairer access to resources. Attempts to support them discreetly proved ineffective, and after I publicly denounced these practices in 2022, I received numerous other testimonies of harassment, misconduct, and sexual violence against staff members or students. This cascade highlighted systemic issues: a lack of empathy for victims, severe conflicts of interest in complaint handling, resistance to sanctioning perpetrators, sloppy research integrity policies, and the university leadership's reluctance to reform paternalistic structures or repair the damage done. Several cases illustrated how institutional reputation was prioritized over transparency and justice [1].

Becoming a whistleblower came with significant costs: professional isolation, budgetary and administrative retaliation by the UCLouvain authorities, exclusion from teaching and research opportunities, and reputational attacks. Yet it also generated some positive outcomes: one dismissed colleague found a new academic position; a wave of testimonies prompted a judicial inquiry (still ongoing); and a commission chaired by Prof. Françoise Tulkens, former Vice-President of the European Court of Human Rights, issued 141 recommendations [2], some of which were adopted. The visibility of these cases helped foster new alliances, including the creation of the Alliance for Equality in Academia, an international NGO that aims to support those who faced career sabotage, moral or sexual harassment, discrimination, abuse of power, as well as silencing and reprisals as targets, victims, or whistleblowers in academia [3].

From this experience, I highlighted key lessons: the importance of persistence, networking, and using every available lever—from media attention to engagement with parliaments and funding agencies. Equity, diversity, and inclusion commitments must be effectively monitored, not just rhetorically invoked in speeches and grant proposals. Ultimately, my fellow whistleblowers should know they are not alone: solidarity networks exist, and truth often prevails, even if slowly.

My final message was one of courage and perseverance: fighting abuse of power is arduous, but it is both possible and necessary to bring about cultural change in academia, restore trust, and ensure safer, more just environments for all researchers, particularly women and racialized persons.

Action helps to restore hope.

References:

[1] To learn more about some of this sad situation, see https://visserlab.be/metoo-university/

[2] The report is available here without its appendices (in French): https://www.uclouvain.be/fr/system/files/uclouvain_assetmanager/groups/cms-editors-edi/documents/Rapport-final-du-Comite-d-experts-vf.pdf

[3] You can contact the AEA at: info@allianceforequalityinacademia.eu. The AEA is launching an independent survey on the Management of Complaints Related to Discrimination, Psychological Harassment, and All Forms of Sexual Violence in Academic Settings; see https://allianceforequalityinacademia.eu

Concluding remarks on the three Key Topics: Power Dynamics, Training and Education, and Trust in Science

Carole Chapin[1], Ana Marušić[2], Loreta Tauginienė[3]

[1] Rectorat ESRI Île-de-France, France

[2] University of Split, School of Medicine, Croatia

[3] Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania

We present here concluding remarks on key topics discussed at the ENRIO 3rd Congress on Research Integrity Practice (ENRIO2025 congress), such as power dynamics, training and education, and trust in science. The remarks are drawn on findings and insights of keynote speakers and other presenters. In addition, the remarks include our personal reflections resulting in areas for future developments.

Power Dynamics

One of the central themes of the ENRIO2025 congress was the exploration of different aspects of power dynamics, with a focus on their impact on research integrity.

Power struggles and abuse of power

Several presentations clarified how these dynamics operate both within academic institutions and in the broader historical, geopolitical and social context. A keynote presentation highlighted that research, particularly in certain specific fields, is subject to increasing pressure in the context of a struggle for epistemic power. The current geopolitical context is also conducive to power struggles: foreign and internal interference poses a threat to research and researchers, leading to the dissemination of misleading results, coercion, political influence and pressure. There is also a legacy of unfair and inequitable research practices in an unequal world: a power imbalance resulting from colonial history and epistemic injustice. Finally, there are power struggles and abuses of power within academic institutions. The congress participants analysed the mechanisms behind the persistence of abusive individual behaviour, such as the abuse of power by some academic leaders, gender-based violence and other discriminatory practices that also create risks of questionable research practices. In some cases that were examined, both in plenary and parallel sessions, the absence of transparent procedures, weak accountability mechanisms and lack of protection against retaliation are perceived as 'institutional betrayal' that undermines the principles of fairness, safety, accountability, and trust that are essential to responsible research environments. Indeed, when organisations fail to address misconduct, it affects science and our trust in our own institutions and, as a result, fuel the discourse on the 'crisis of trust' in science. The data and analyses presented at the congress also questioned the ability of research performing organisations to ensure a safe academic culture: effectiveness of reporting, mediation, protection of whistleblowers and appropriate corrective measures.

Empowerment

Power dynamics can also be synonymous with empowerment. A round table discussion provided an opportunity to show how, in response to abuses of power, empowerment strengthens those

affected, helping them to find their voice and stand up to such abuses, to speak openly about the facts and to defend the truth. Empowerment can also come from institutions, by changing the focus and/or criteria for recognition. As recommended in various sessions, it is essential to recognise and support those who take on or are entrusted with essential tasks such as mentoring, education and teaching, and to value and reward them. The ENRIO2025 congress was an opportunity to advocate for an open, safe, and inclusive research environment, which is the foundation of research integrity in everyday practice. In the context of training, the perspective of empowerment can help to highlight the power structures inherent in academia and show how empowerment is necessary at different levels in organisations, both at the individual and collective levels and at the systemic level.

How can and should universities and research communities respond?

Participants agreed that more research is needed on these specific power dynamics in order to reveal threats to research and specific situations. The congress provided an opportunity to present various initiatives aimed at quantifying retaliation effects. Important recommendations were made, including how to conduct research without perpetuating power imbalances, and how to commit to research integrity, particularly in a crisis context. The ENRIO2025 congress was an opportunity to highlight solidarity, international dialogue and the exchange of good practices. The congress participants presented several platforms (e.g. legislative, social, health or media) at different levels (supranational, national, industrial, institutional, departmental and individual) that could be and have been used in processes to prevent abuses of power.

The congress served as a call to action and an incentive to establish stronger systems to protect researchers from abuse of power. Institutions presented initiatives aimed at linking these efforts to broader integrity challenges, including whistleblower protection, academic freedom, and non-discrimination. Presentations on innovative training policies and practices helped to share ideas for raising awareness and empowering researchers to challenge and report misconduct and abuse of power. Ultimately, the congress recognised that safety, equality, diversity, inclusion and freedom from reprisals are essential elements of research integrity that must be integrated into organisational systems, for example by defining power abuse in academia and examining whether it may also constitute a misconduct in research practice.

Training and Education

Training and education were a big topic of the Congress, with four workshops, two plenary presentations, eleven oral presentations, and one poster dedicated to this topic.

The workshops addressed different approaches to training research integrity, from the training rubric from The Network for Education and Research Quality (NERQ), over the challenged to the intersection between open science and intellectual property from the Open Science Learning GATE initiative to case-based approach to research integrity training from Estonia and training about artificial intelligence for ethics experts by Erasmus+ project *BriGRETE*.

The two plenary presentations presented important aspects of research integrity training: power dynamics inherent to many research practices and setting reasonable expectations from research integrity training, as a part of a continual education process.

Oral presentations and a poster showed a rich landscape of efforts, interventions and results from a wide variety of research integrity trainings, with many useful tools and approaches.

Trust in Science

In two keynote speeches and ten presentations, different aspects of trust in science were addressed, along with various ways for development and preservation. This demonstrates that an understanding of trust plurality is intrinsic to the research ecosystem, which comprises

various stakeholders. Therefore, trust in science can be described as a multifaceted concept, encompassing inputs, process, results, and effects. It includes values, dispositions, action, and reflection.

Inputs (no trust without us). It is paramount that all stakeholders engaged in the research ecosystem are empowered to identify emerging developments (e.g. the usage of artificial intelligence tools for research purposes, research security) and related risks, including those affecting research integrity. These stakeholders comprise national and institutional leaders, research ethics committees, experts in the field, and other individuals. In this context, mutual understanding (reciprocity) should be established as a foundational principle not only among researchers, but also between researchers and their institutions, such as when expressing concerns or reporting cases. Reciprocity should guide interactions in a trusted manner. Achieving this goal requires all stakeholders to be proactive and determined. For example, researchers are expected to participate in relevant training, regardless of their professional experience or career stage, to show that their competencies are reliable in collaborative (international) research.

Process (no trust without interaction). Trust in science grows through collaborative undertakings in taking co-responsibilities. Here, shared responsibility is essential and refers to the research community, their affiliated institutions, policy makers, research funding organizations, publishers, (social) media, the public, and other relevant stakeholders. For example, addressing societal issues may involve adopting open approaches in research practice, such as incorporating citizen science or supporting citizen-driven research projects. Similarly, to foster research integrity culture, there should be no fear in discussing difficult topics and addressing power imbalances. Establishing and adhering to rules are important in these contexts.

Results (no trust without accomplishments). All stakeholders engaged in the research ecosystem are expected to be trusted. The question remains open how we could evidence this. Does reporting cases, whether they involve malpractice or not, or engaging with the public through (online) social media demonstrate sufficient openness, transparency, and public accountability? Why is a barometer's static value of 8 better than 9, and what does this mean for the research community, their affiliated institutions and other relevant stakeholders? Should we strive for perfectionism or balance in trust in science? Can trust in science have negative consequences? Should we focus on trustability and trustworthiness rather than on trust at individual, institutional, and systemic levels?

Effects (no trust without impact). Research and discussions in the context of trust in science should be further developed. For example: Does the number or amount of commissioned research indicate trust in science? How do we frame research waste here? What role does scientific, and science communication play here? Are we contributing to the creation of elite circles at the expense of openness? More importantly, the role of research integrity needs here to be clearly articulated and transcend all levels and aspects of research governance and practice.

To conclude, we are here to be trusted; so, let's do our best.

Responsibility in research: The relationship between open science, research ethics, and responsible assessment

Laura Niemi[1], *Janne Pölönen*[2]

[1]*University of Turku, Finland*

[2]*The Federation of Finnish Learned Societies, Finland*

Despite their centrality, research ethics and open science are often discussed separately. Sometimes research ethics may even be seen as unnecessarily preventing open science from being realized – or open science may be seen as a threat to the ethical implementation of research. In a responsible research culture, ethics and openness support each other. The close relationship between scientific openness and ethics becomes concrete when a responsible research culture is viewed as good scientific practices. Moreover, currently responsible assessment frameworks are evolving to better recognize and incentivize these ethical and open practices, ensuring that research is conducted and evaluated in a manner that upholds the highest standards of integrity and responsibility.

To understand the relationship between open science, research ethics, and responsible assessment, it is essential to explore how these concepts intersect and support each other. The link between open science, research ethics, and responsible research assessment lies in their shared commitment to transparency, accountability, and integrity in research. By integrating these elements there is an opportunity to enhance the quality and impact of research while adhering to ethical standards and fostering a culture of responsibility within the scientific community.

The purpose of this presentation is to examine the conceptual alignment between research ethics, open science and responsible assessment. In this presentation we also compare the goals and agendas set for research ethics, open science, and responsible assessment through analysis of the key documents such as The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity, UNESCO Recommendation of Open Science, and the Agreement of reforming Research Assessment. Moreover, we note that recently the term 'research security' has come to be widely used and in this presentation, we take this emerging approach under our scrutiny and discuss also how it relates to research ethics, open science and responsible assessment.

References: Biagetti, M.T., Gedutis, A. & Ma, L. (2020). Ethical Theories in Research Evaluation: An Exploratory Approach, Scholarly Assessment Reports. https://doi.org/10.29024/sar.19. Leonelli, S. (2024), Philosophy of Open Science, Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009416368 Peruginelli, G. & Pölönen, J. (2023) The legal foundation of responsible research assessment: An overview on European Union and Italy, Research Evaluation. https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvad035

Mental Health in Academia: surviving or thriving? Results from a nationwide survey on mental health and social safety in the Netherlands

Joeri Tijdink

Amsterdam UMC, Netherlands

In the past years, a plethora of evidence has shed light on the problems researchers are facing. Not only is there ample evidence of mental health issues in individual researchers (1), but there is also more emphasis on systemic factors that influence the behavior of researchers, such as research culture, publication pressure (2), and the influence of evaluation practices on researchers' behavior. The latter is often perceived as hampering academic progress, as these numbers determine your success as a researcher.

Let's start with some numbers about mental health in academia: more than 40% of doctoral students showed signs of depression (data from China and Flanders) (3). In the US, a survey conducted by Nature (4) that explored mental health in doctoral students reported that 36% of participants sought mental support because of depressive or anxiety symptoms.

Interestingly, mental health is linked to publication pressure and unhealthy or unsafe research cultures. One of the main burdens in this group is the current assessment criteria. Academic prestige and advancement are mainly assessed by your publication record, including the number of publications, citation record, and acquired funding. Consequently, most researchers primarily focus on these metrics in order to pursue a career in academia. And what gets measured gets managed—resulting in researchers mainly focusing on authorships, citations, and acquiring grants—which is considered to contribute to a publish-or-perish culture and an impact factor mania. Moreover, a (research) environment, including working conditions and safety, can significantly influence wellbeing and mental health problems. The question is whether academics are resilient and can cope well, or whether these external pressures are affecting their mental health.

To this end, the Young Academy in the Netherlands started a nationwide survey on mental health, working conditions, and psychological safety. With validated questionnaires, we were able to include more than 2,000 responses from academics in the Netherlands.

In the presentation, we present the first results: 25% of academics have moderate to severe depressive symptoms, and more than 20% report high levels of stress. These mental health problems are associated with feeling unsafe and experiencing high workload. Based on these results, we start a discussion with the audience to reflect on the most pressing risk factors in academia—and, most importantly, how we can address those issues on an individual, cultural, and systemic level.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank our dear colleagues from the young Academy for their continuous efforts to make this research endeavour a success

1. Loissel E. A question of support. eLife. 2019;8:e52881. 2. Tijdink JK, Verbeke R, Smulders YM. Publication pressure and scientific misconduct in medical scientists. J Empir Res Hum Res Ethics. 2014;9(5):64-71. 3. Levecque K, Anseel F, De Beuckelaer A, Van der Heyden J, Gisle L. Work organization and mental health problems in PhD students. Research Policy. 2017;46(4):868-79. 4. The mental health of PhD researchers demands urgent attention. Nature. 2019;575(7782):257-8.

Dialogue towards ethical participation. A qualitative study of Deaf people's research experiences

Tomasz Krawczyk, Jan Piasecki, Marcin Waligora

Jagiellonian University Medical College, Poland

Research engagement of Deaf people raises several ethical challenges. Research itself is a field of dispute about deafness. Various deafness-related fields function rather separately and develop their own epistemologies. Moreover, Deaf communities around the world are diverse in the recognition of group identities, shared history and faced marginalisation. Despite such a complex situation, there is a few research exploring experiences of Deaf people from participation and engagement in research aiming to inform and facilitate ethical research conduct.

Our study aimed to explore the experiences, opinions and needs of Deaf people related to research participation. We also wanted to highlight the ethical issues present within the research process, the relations between researchers and participants, as well as consider the impact of research on the community. To facilitate deep expressions and reach a diverse group of Deaf people, we conducted a bilingual (Polish and Polish Sign Language) open-ended online questionnaire. We received 52 responses and analysed results using an experiential approach to reflexive thematic analysis.

We employed a semi-participatory design, including pre-design consultations with Deaf community members, and several meetings with an advisory group of Deaf people during the course of thematic analysis. Together, we developed six themes reflecting the current and desired state of things, as well as potential means to achieve them: (i) We want to develop research among Deaf people, (ii) Science is not accessible to us, (iii) We have bad experiences, (iv) Science gives new opportunities and perspectives, (v) We want full accessibility, and (vi) Let us establish trust. They highlight the issues of social and epistemic (in)justice for Deaf people, and also the need for greater research accessibility and dialogue with both Deaf communities and individual participants and/or co-researchers. Thus, these themes were embraced under one overarching theme: It's all about dialogue.

Our research enable us to include the perspectives of Deaf people into debates on ethical participation and engagement in research. It may contribute to enhancing ethical inclusion of Deaf people (as well as other underrepresented populations) in research and support the development of evidence-informed normative recommendations for scientific cooperation between Deaf people and researchers.

Assessing the perceptions, experiences and needs of researchers in Amsterdam for fostering a positive research culture

Rita Santos[1], Miriam van Loon[1], Krishma Labib[2], Janette Huijser[1], Joeri Tijdink[1], Mariette van den Hoven[1]

[1]Amsterdam UMC, Netherlands

[2]Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Netherlands

Recently, helping to foster an academic environment where researchers feel valued, thrive in their work, and are fairly recognised and rewarded for their scientific merit has been prioritised for higher education institutions and national and transnational initiatives. In the Netherlands, all Higher Education Institutions are signatories of the Dutch Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. The Code specifies the duties of care that institutions should adopt to foster responsible research practices and to promote a positive research culture. Transnational movements such as the Coalition for Advancing Researchers Assessment (CoARA) and the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) have reinforced the urgency to rethink traditional metrics for assessing researchers' performance.

Despite these collective efforts, studies in the Netherlands still point out systemic issues in the way researchers conduct research and are assessed and rewarded. Reforming institutional policies to sustainably embed responsible research practices, along with fair recognition and rewards for academic careers, requires an evidence-based approach to assess how researchers perceive and experience their institutions' research climate and the concrete needs to foster a more positive institutional climate.

Building on a Horizon Europe project focused on institutional transformation pathways in higher education (CATALISI), we compared how researchers in two higher education institutions in Amsterdam, at different career stages, perceive and experience their institutions' research culture regarding responsible research practices and the recognition and rewards of scientific outputs (research question 1) and whether junior researchers have different needs in fostering a positive research culture compared to senior researchers (research question 2).

We conducted two studies. First, a qualitative study, using semi-structured interviews, to understand how researchers perceive research culture and how they think it could be improved at different levels. Second, using a non-validated online survey, we assessed researchers' perceptions and experiences regarding responsible research practices and the recognition and rewards of scientific outputs. Furthermore, we explored the diverse needs of researchers, from early career researchers to senior researchers and those in leadership positions, to foster a positive research culture. We built and expanded our online survey based on similar studies. Our interview study involved 15 participants (including junior and senior researchers and policy advisors), and we will soon implement our online survey.

Our interview study confirmed the need to stimulate a positive research culture further. Participants reported that academia is still driven by an academic reward system focusing on academic output, where financial incentives may lead to questionable research practices or even scientific misconduct. During the presentation, we will further explore the results from the interview study and online survey. We will also reflect on the broader context of our findings for policy recommendations and explore ways to initiate dialogues on fostering a positive research climate with the audience.

Empowering early career researchers to foster research culture change towards a responsible research climate

Barbara Leitner, Joeri Tijdink, Mariette van den Hoven

AmsterdamUMC, Netherlands

A healthy research culture often goes hand in hand with the practice of responsible science. The contributions of early-career researchers (ECRs) are an essential component of this culture. Still, ECRs often fail to understand or recognize the important role they could play in changing or influencing research culture within their institutions or research teams. Empowerment can be a crucial element to support ECRs in this difficult task. To this end, we have developed a set of educational workshops that aim to empower ECRs to gain insights into what role they can play in this change and how they can contribute to a responsible research climate.

The educational workshop is designed to enhance the conversational skills of ECRs by utilizing four videos. Each of these videos depicts common dilemmas ECRs may encounter in their day-to-day lives in academia and research: dealing with incapable supervisors, burdens of collaborative work, conflicts of interest, and difficulties in taking initiative. In our educational program, ECRs are encouraged to reflect on and consider different ways to respond to each situation through a “choose your own adventure” mechanism embedded in the videos. These scenarios will be played out and are used as conversation starters for their own practices.

Through a pre- and post-workshop questionnaire, we aim to better understand the factors that may influence empowerment among ECRs. By doing so, the workshop can be better adapted to fit the needs of ECRs. In the presentation, we will present the first results of the 4 workshops that we have conducted in the past year. We will present what factors are associated with empowerment and how you can contribute to a better research culture.

Searchable libraries of RI case reports and published decisions: how Scandinavia pioneers transparency, and a demo of a new Dutch tool

Lodewijk Pet[1], *Kalle Videnoja*[2], *Bert Seghers*[3]

[1]*Leiden University Medical Centre, Netherlands*

[2]*European Network of Research Integrity Offices, Finland*

[3]*Flemish Commission for Research Integrity, Belgium*

Public transparency on investigated research integrity cases is immensely valuable. It sets expectations for those who consider reporting a malpractice, and it enables the scientific community to learn. Research on case reports can yield key recommendations for soft harmonization. These advantages still hold if the reports are anonymised. Even anonymised summaries carry many of these benefits.

However, public transparency is not the norm in European institutions and countries. With the exception of Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands, public reporting is still in a very immature stage across Europe. Even within one country, disagreement among institutions is possible about to which extent they should communicate openly about their cases (even about the number of them). That such openness is still in its infancy in France and Germany is because complaint handling there relies on mediation rather than a formal investigation by an advisory committee.

In the first half of this talk, we look at the openness of investigation results from an internationally comparative lens. Finland's second advisory body TENK discloses anonymised summaries of all the cases it has ruled on since 2010. The Swedish body NPOF has only existed since 2020 but has a database where you can read its 132 decisions in full, with only the names and identifiable passages erased. Norway has a similar situation. The Danish body on scientific misconduct combines both: it publishes all its own decisions in full but anonymised (only on FFP) and reports anonymised summaries of the cases handled by Danish institutions, who are required to report to the national body (only non-FFP).

In the second, we discuss current evolutions in the Netherlands, where the second advisory body LOWI also publishes opinions anonymised and in full. The first author is working on a jurisprudence platform that will enable searching and visualising all decisions from publicly available sources — both from institutional investigation committees as from LOWI. He will demonstrate this tool, giving descriptive insights into the cases of LOWI, and a dynamic figure showing the timelines of all these trajectories first-and-second-advice cases. This provides a clear, visual overview of how investigation processes unfold over time. Furthermore, it is demonstrated how one can sort, filter, or find specific cases and extract data from them.

College research ethics boards of Quebec, Canada (REBs): mandate, governance and resources

Emmanuelle Marceau

Cégep du du Vieux Montréal and University of Montréal , Canada

A number of Quebec colleges have adopted institutional policies on research ethics and set up research ethics boards (REBs) in recent years [1]. These committees are mandated to ensure compliance with the principles of research ethics, as set out in the Tri-Council Policy Statement 2 (TCPS 2) [2], an obligation endorsed by the signing of the Agreement on the administration of agency grants and awards by research institutions [3]. Since research in the college network is conducted in small institutions, but yet rich, diversified and unique environment [1], the deployment of research ethics in this context raises some particular challenges [1]. Little research has been done on these challenges and has attempted to find solutions. The aim of this study was to characterize these issues by drawing on the real-life experience of the stakeholders in the ethics review of research projects. To achieve this, we conducted a five-week interactive consultation using a real-time Delphi platform. We felt that three issues were particularly important and that they were the focus of our attention in this study: 1) the limited resources for the evaluation of college research; 2) the complexity of evaluating multi-jurisdictional research projects ; and 3) the burden that can be placed on the evaluation of research activities conducted by students in the context of courses whose primary objective is pedagogical. This communication will be an opportunity to address the main conclusions of the Delphi study, which led to a publication, as well as setting out the tools developed as part of this research project to better support the research ethics community at colleges.

Acknowledgements : We would like to thank our research partner the Association pour la recherche au collégial (ARC), for its help and support in carrying out this project. This project is financed by the Fonds de recherche du Québec (FRQ), as part of the Ethi_C program.

[1] Masella M.A., Dupras C., Marceau E., Can J Bioeth, 7, 2-3 (2024) [2] Instituts de recherche en santé du Canada, Conseil de recherches en sciences naturelles et en génie du Canada, Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines du Canada. Énoncé de politique des trois conseils, éthique de la recherche avec des êtres humains. (2022) [3] Instituts de recherche en santé du Canada, Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines du Canada, Conseil de recherches en sciences naturelles et en génie du Canada. Entente sur l'administration des subventions et des bourses des organismes par les établissements de recherche (2020)

Extreme citizen science – challenges and opportunities of citizen engagement and inclusion

Veikko Ikonen

VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland Ltd., Finland

Citizen science as an approach or methodology is not new, but re-invented, especially when this approach has been recently emphasized in EU projects. At its simplest, citizens are used solely as observers or data collectors, but taken further, citizens may also participate in data analysis and broader observation of their environment or activities. When citizen are more integrated from planning to implementation of research and development actions the aim of the research genuinely seeks contextual knowledge and move from the concept of acceptability, which still contains a kind of compulsion and conditionality to the concept of desirability, which does not rule out compromises but genuinely aims to take into account the needs, requirements, and wishes of the actors.

Some reflections and questions of these various research setups regarding extreme citizen science should be considered. Of course, it is critically important that roles and responsibilities are clearly defined and predetermined, regardless of the setup. Even though equal status might be the goal in co-research or extreme citizen science, it is challenging for this to be fully realized within a research context. Achieving equality, or more precisely, equity in a research context also requires equal resource allocation, a strong trust relationship (which typically does not happen immediately or easily), and genuine dialogue (i.e., open, direct, and empathetic interaction). Naturally, there are also studies where the researcher, the subject, and ethical pre-assessment must address various safety threats (large or small, physical or other types) or potential so-called incidental or unexpected findings that should involve protective measures for individuals.

Conducting research naturally involves the question of expertise, capability, and the production of knowledge and understanding. Bringing together contextual knowledge and theorizing is, of course, essential when aiming to create an in-depth depiction of the phenomenon and considering various short- and long-term effects both locally and globally. Researching with citizens or co-researching can increase citizens' trust in science, while on the other hand, the trust in the quality of research by the scientific community can be questioned when contributions from so-called amateur researchers are involved. Diversity, equity and inclusion are central considerations in extreme citizen science as in this kind of community-based research approaches biases may rise from the composition of the citizen scientists: who are you representing, what is your role in the community and how the power relationships in the community are considered e.g. in research with indigenous groups. The extreme citizen science approach requires more time, training (e.g. in research integrity and cultural sensitivity) and resources in general but could also bring better results for everyone. Thus, some universal practical guidelines should be provided for the better implementation of the approach.

Use of participatory techniques and roleplay for research integrity training: addressing complex situations and power dynamics

Estelle Jaligot

CIRAD, France

Among the recommendations aiming at improving research integrity culture and practices within research-performing organisations (RPOs), there is a general consensus that research integrity (RI) trainings tailored to a diversity of disciplines and career stages should be provided to research staff and students alike.

In France, several laws articulating RI obligations for both RPOs and PhD students have been implemented since 2016. These obligations include that of providing training (for RPOs) and undergoing training (for PhD students). While these laws have improved basic knowledge of RI principles among PhD students, the lack of a similar obligation of RI training for PhD supervisors has created a situation of inequity between these two populations. This, in turn, tends to add to pre-existing tensions caused by power dynamics and as a result, both students and supervisors experience difficulties in implementing the principles of RI in their daily activities and struggle to find a common ground between their respective perceptions and practices. This is even more true in cases of cross-borders supervisions, since perceptions and practices of RI may be variable depending on the cultural background.

CIRAD is a research organisation working in the field of agricultural development with countries of the global South, where cross-border PhD supervision (most of which involves Low- or Middle-Income Countries of the global South) represents more than half of the total number of PhDs supervised. RI training is not always available or accessible to foreign students enrolled in Doctoral Schools based in the global South, which generates an additional situation of inequity among PhD students.

Both as a trainer in scientific writing and as a research integrity officer, I have successfully used participatory techniques and roleplay in order to provide RI training to CIRAD staff (research and support), foreign partners and PhD students (French and foreign), both in France and abroad. I will discuss how these methods have proved beneficial for illustrating seemingly abstract notions and giving life to complex situations resulting from the interplay between RI principles and interpersonal relationships. I will also show how their implementation may improve both the dialogue between different type of actors and their attitude with respect to RI dilemmas.

Research Misconduct and the Law: Complementary, Underutilised or Misunderstood?

Kritika Sharma

Luxembourg Agency for Research Integrity, Luxembourg

This paper aims at analysing the interconnection between the law and research misconduct, particularly with a focus on cases of serious research misconduct. The overarching aim is to understand how existing and prospective legal procedures can strengthen institutional initiatives towards safeguarding 'open, safe and inclusive research environments'. The objective of this paper is to understand what the law can and cannot do in relation to cases of serious research misconduct to determine whether it can have a positive and reinforcing role, one that might currently be underutilised. With this aim in view, this paper is divided into three parts. First, it sets out the ambit of the law with relevance for cases of research misconduct. This involves setting out what the law already does, pertaining to both civil and criminal matters, distinguishing between these clearly. It also sets out what the law does not yet do, in relation to such cases. Second, this paper highlights the reasons for which existing avenues within the law may not yet be fully utilised. It highlights three reasons for this. These include the lack of awareness and understanding of the potential of engaging with legal measures, and lack of appropriate trigger mechanisms for initiating legal proceedings in potential criminal cases and finally a reluctance towards initiating civil proceedings and the cost of such proceedings. Finally, in the third section this paper suggests proposals to address each of these issues in order to promote reliance on the law in addressing cases of research misconduct. These suggestions are based on the premise that such reliance on the law should be complementary to existing (and non-legal) channels to deal with research misconduct and should reinforce instead of replace existing mechanisms. These proposals involve first, including the topic of available legal avenues as part of the research integrity curriculum, as well as training of staff. Second, this paper suggests revising staff codes of conduct to include trigger mechanisms to initiate legal proceedings if and when necessary, in egregious cases of research misconduct. Finally, the paper suggests an emphasis on the need to document and report on any alleged breach of the law discovered through investigations conducted for alleged research misconduct.

Upholding Research Integrity in a Changing Landscape: Insights from Springer Nature

Asja Prohic

Springer Nature, France

As the research landscape continues to evolve with the advent of new technologies, there is growing interest in how publishers uphold the accuracy and integrity of scholarly work. This proposal aims to showcase Springer Nature's research integrity efforts, highlighting investments in both people and technology, and outlining the proactive measures being implemented.

Maintaining trust in high-quality research involves a series of integrity checks that are integrated throughout the editorial and publishing processes. These checks are supported by artificial intelligence tools, a dedicated research integrity team, and editorial staff. As such, research integrity is embedded throughout the research lifecycle—from safeguarding the publication record and equipping editors to remove problematic content, to providing the broader scientific community with training and resources that promote rigour and good practice.

As technologies for generating fraudulent material advance, Springer Nature remains committed to developing innovative AI solutions. Tools such as Geppetto (which detects AI-generated content), SnappShot (which identifies image manipulation), and other AI systems are being employed to enhance editorial quality checks and streamline the peer review process, including the identification and management of potential conflicts of interest.

This proposal will explore how these AI tools align with Springer Nature's ethical principles for AI use, and examine how researchers themselves perceive the integration of AI into submission screening. What do our findings from a mixed-methods study involving over 700 researchers tell us about their expectations and concerns regarding the use of AI by publishers?

Ultimately, research integrity is a shared responsibility that requires sustained collaboration across countries, institutions, and disciplines. Beyond simply detecting and resolving cases of misconduct, how can publishers contribute to preventing breaches of integrity at national or institutional levels?

Our presentation will address these two questions while first demonstrating how research integrity is fundamentally embedded in the work of the publisher.

Predatory and papermill practices in a small predatory journal – A case study involving a journal with links towards Turkey, Pakistan and Iran

Wouter Vandevelde

KU Leuven, Belgium

Background: The Research Integrity and Ethics Unit of my host institution was contacted by a senior researcher, acting on behalf of four researchers who found out they were listed as joint authors of a paper they did not write and were not even aware of. Upon a closer look, the same study was also published in a different journal, in another language and with a different set of authors. After multiple emails to multiple persons at the first journal, the manuscript with the wrongful attribution of authorship was withdrawn, but no explanation was given on how or why the paper had been published in the first place.

This case raises clear issues of plagiarism and identity theft. It triggered me to look into the journal that published the paper with the wrongful attribution of authorship. A first, superficial screening identified several worrisome practices, which question the quality and intentions of the journal. Moreover, a further analysis of papers in the same journal suggested problems with a substantial proportion of its published work. To learn more on the modus operandi of this supposedly predatory journal, I decided to dig deeper.

Methodology: The information on the journal's website was analysed by comparing its current content against previous versions on the Internet Archive to evaluate the journal's evolution over time. In a complementary approach, all articles published by the journal (46 articles at the time of writing) were analysed using plagiarism detection software, combined with reverse text searches looking for specific phrases or results.

Results: I will present a qualitative and quantitative overview of my findings on the journal, its publisher and the articles published in the journal. I will, among others, illustrate the ease with which the journal switches publishers and engages in other forms of identity theft such as the listing members of the editorial board without their knowledge. I will show that some content is backdated to make it appear published at earlier dates to generate content for older volumes. Finally, my analysis of the individual papers will demonstrate identity theft, plagiarism and republication of identical papers in different journals.

Conclusion: It appears that fake papers are generated to provide content for the journal with the aim of making it appear trustworthy. Unfortunately, the backdating of content and the moving of articles across different issues makes it difficult to assess where and when duplicated papers were published first. Given that this case appears to be but only of many, together with the fact that maleficent journals will become better in evading detection, it is of utmost importance to get a better understanding of how these papermilling, predatory journals work.

Fake papers with real authors, but unaware of the publication: how to fight, respond to and adapt to “forged authorship” / identity theft

Bert Seghers[1], *Wouter Vandevelde*[2], *Paula Saner*[3], *Hjördis Czesnick*[4]

[1]*Flemish Commission for Research Integrity, Belgium*

[2]*KU Leuven, Belgium*

[3]*University of Cape Town, South Africa*

[4]*Ombuds Committee for Research Integrity, Germany*

A researcher notices that they are listed as an author of an article in a journal, without their knowing. It quickly turns out that the paper is not only of low quality, but probably fake and AI-generated, or containing plagiarism and published in a predatory journal. This practice of forged authorship seems to be on the rise, and may constitute a criminal act of “identity theft”. Also problematic is the misuse of institutional affiliation: fake papers with names of non-existing “authors” from reputable institutions. Both actions put individual and institutional reputations at stake.

This has nothing to do with a lack of integrity of professional researchers, working in an institutional framework of accountability. Quite to the contrary: These practices seem to be run by criminals abroad, who find ways to exploit the system of scientific publishing for financial gain.

The motive for adding the name of respected scholars as authors of fake papers, or institutes as fake affiliations? Presumably an act of the publisher to pad out the page count and make the journal appear more reputable. Some also hypothesize that enemy colleagues may submit fake papers under the victim’s name.

We have been involved in resolving various cases of forged authorship and pirated affiliation in three countries, and will shortly share the testimonies of these cases and some perspectives. The second part will be a discussion with the audience on how to respond to and fight this seemingly growing form of research crime. For example:

(1) How can the research community respond to this malpractice? What do “victims” of these identity theft practices need? What can they do themselves, and how can institutions support them? Should victims add a disclaimer in their cv, warning for fake papers in their name? Where should we raise awareness for this new type of fraud? How can the Retraction Watch Database help?

(2) How will we fight these criminal practices? As long as there is close-to-zero risk of being caught or sanctioned, we cannot expect these sinister journals and practices to fade out. How are responsibilities distributed between funders, the publishing industry and organisations representing the scientific community? Which role can we expect of public prosecutors of countries? What can be done at the international level?

[1] Orally Ivan, ‘Perplexed’ author’s identity forged on plagiarized paper in ‘probably fake’ journal, Retraction Watch, June 2024, https://retractionwatch.com/2024/06/14/perplexed-authors-identity-forged-on-plagiarized-paper-in-probably-fake-journal/#more-129395 [2] Kincaid Elly, ‘Still angry’: Chemist finds his name on a study he didn’t write, Retraction Watch, January 2025, https://retractionwatch.com/2025/01/13/chemist-martin-mcphillie-journal-biochemical-technology/ [3] Sohn Rebecca, One year later, bioinformatics journal with unclear leadership yet to retract plagiarized article, october 2023, https://retractionwatch.com/2023/10/02/one-year-later-bioinformatics-journal-with-unclear-leadership-yet-to-retract-plagiarized-article/

What is Gender Bias in Grant Peer-review?

Emre Özel

Respublit, France

The peer review process is central to research grant allocation, shaping scientific careers and knowledge production. Despite increased gender diversity in academia, disparities in research funding success rates suggest the persistence of bias in grant peer review (Witteman et al., 2019). While gender bias in academia has been widely studied, research on grant peer review remains fragmented, often focusing on individual disciplines and neglecting the multi-stage nature of selection processes.

This paper explores gender bias in grant peer review by identifying key mechanisms, including implicit and explicit biases (Greenwald & Lai, 2020) and stereotypical beliefs (Hengel, 2017). The study distinguishes between expert panels, responsible for initial selections, and external reviewers, who evaluate full proposals, and examines how gendered perceptions influence decision-making.

Additionally, this analysis considers the broader academic ecosystem, where gender disparities in faculty hiring, manuscript review, and professional networks amplify bias in grant funding (Huang et al., 2020). Women's underrepresentation in senior academic positions limits their access to leadership roles and funding opportunities, further reinforcing career disadvantages. Moreover, biases in grant allocation perpetuate gender gaps in academia.

A major challenge in addressing gender bias in grant peer review is the lack of publicly available data on reviewer decisions and funding outcomes. Increased transparency and structured evaluation criteria are necessary to identify and mitigate bias. Standardized scoring rubrics and reviewer training programs could help reduce subjective bias and promote fairness in funding decisions.

By synthesizing interdisciplinary research, this study contributes to discussions on equity in grant peer review and proposes a framework for analyzing bias in funding decisions. Addressing these biases is crucial for fostering a fair and inclusive scientific ecosystem where funding decisions are based on merit rather than gendered perceptions.

References: Greenwald, A. G., & Lai, C. K. (2020). Implicit social cognition. Annual Review of Psychology, 71, 419–445. Hengel, E. (2017). Publishing while female. Are women held to higher standards? Cambridge Working Papers in Economics, 1753, University of Cambridge. Huang, J., Gates, A. J., Sinatra, R., & Barabási, A. L. (2020). Historical comparison of gender inequality in scientific careers across countries and disciplines. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 117(9), 4609–4616. Witteman, H. O., Hendricks, M., Straus, S., & Tannenbaum, C. (2019). Are gender gaps due to evaluations of the applicant or the science? A natural experiment at a national funding agency. The Lancet, 393(10171), 531–540.

Epistemological Issues Relating to the Fabrication of Research Results

Jovana Mihajlović Trbovc

Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts (ZRC SAZU), Slovenia

Fabrication of research results is predominantly discussed primarily as a gross violation of research integrity, while the main focus is usually given to the issue how to adequately sanction the perpetrator and what kind of ramifications such a misdemeanour should require. When discussing larger social context in which fabrication of research results takes place, usually two issues are tackled: the push effect of the ever more severe "publish or perish" norm, and the pull effect of predatory journals with low peer-review scrutiny. In contrast, this paper examines the issue of research result fabrication through an epistemological lens, addressing the following questions:

(1) How does fabrication conducted by an individual influence knowledge production within a research discipline as a whole?

(2) How do methods that require the anonymisation of sources or respondents contribute to fabrication practices?

(3) What measures can be implemented to prevent the reproduction of false or fabricated knowledge or facts?

By examining a case of a proven and sanctioned case of a Slovene researcher, renowned both in local public and international academia, this paper analyses the long-term effects of fabricated results on knowledge production in a certain disciplinary field. The paper thus argues how (inadequate) sanctioning that focuses on disciplinary actions against the perpetrator leaves room for reproduction of false/fabricated knowledge/facts in international academic arena. The paper further proposes that sanctioning strategies should evolve beyond the mere disciplining of the individual, to foster integrity in knowledge production at both the global and national levels.

Can E-learning formats provide effective research integrity training for doctoral researchers at large institutions?

Viktor Scholz

Center for Open and Responsible Research, Berlin University Alliance, Germany

The continuously rising attention on research integrity leads to a rising demand for training offers. The need for more integrity training, in the German academic context, especially in doctoral education, is evident.[1] In recent years, HEIs are reacting to this situation, as well as to new funding requirements for more engagement in research integrity structures. Comprehensive integrity training of doctoral students, however, is also an infrastructural challenge, especially at large HEIs or alliances. Within the Berlin University Alliance, for example, roughly 3,000 people start their doctorate each year. Offering sustainable live trainings for cohorts of this size is a challenge, especially in the context of funding cuts and structural overwork in academia.

At first glance, E-learning might formats seem like a viable solution to this challenge. Yet in the context of research integrity training, these formats have been criticized, given the highly discipline specific nature of research practices and the sensibility of the topic, both requiring reflective live exchange.[2;3;4] So, (how) can E-learning formats address these criticisms?

The presentation will share the experiences of the E-learning course “Good Research Practice for Doctoral Students” that has been developed at the Berlin University Alliance, launching in April 2025. The 10h introductory course is directed to researchers of all disciplines and addresses the relevant institutional, national and European guidelines with a focus on research data, plagiarism, authorship, publication, and conflict management. It was designed to motivate participants to reflect their own practices as much as possible, both in terms of contents, which put a strong focus on questionable research practices and dilemmas rather than binary solutions, and in terms of didactic design, with professionally-produced video talks by different experts and an attractive course environment. At the hand of initial course evaluations, these experiences might help to initiate a broader discussion about the necessary design efforts to be put in effective, activating, and sustainable research integrity E-learning formats.

Acknowledgements: The E-Learning course “Good Research Practice for Doctoral Researchers” was produced under the responsibility of project leader Marcus Edler and coordinator Viktor Scholz with funding from the Objective “Promoting Talent” of the Berlin University Alliance.

References: [1] Gommel, Verse, Nolte, et al., Bioethica Forum 14, 1 (2021) [2] Shephard, Trotman, Furnari, et al. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management 37,6 (2015) [3] Abdi, Pizzolato, Nemery, et al. Science and Engineering Ethics 27, 1 (2021) [4] Labib, Evans, Roje, et al. Science and Public Policy 49,2 (2022)

The Open Science Learning GATE - Supporting Capacity Building

***Julia Priess-Buchheit*, Marie Alavi**

Kiel University, Germany

The Open Science Learning Gate (GATE, www.openscienceGATE.com) is an initiative that aims to support responsible research conduct and foster trustworthy research and innovation. At the heart of GATE lies the commitment to professionalizing Open Science (education) within research and higher education environments. By harmonizing OS training and highlighting resources with community-driven principles, the GATE endeavours to uphold research integrity, research ethics, and the ethical use of artificial intelligence tools.

This presentation will delve into how the GATE acts as a catalyst for high-quality and customized OS training tailored to the needs of diverse actors within the OS ecosystem. We will explore the meticulous process of collecting, screening, and reflecting on educational resources to ensure adherence to current norms. We will show the integration of empirical data collection from training experts and the research community through the GATE service, crediting the GATE guidelines. The talk will follow a design-based approach by first showing how the GATE intersects and collects data, then presenting what data was already collected for the target group of researchers and students, proceeding with an overview of what analyses will be used to develop an overview of 2025's open science standards.

Attendees will gain insights into the GATE's mechanism of enabling trainers to keep their training current, connecting their training efforts to a broader community through the GATE. By facilitating the dissemination of OS practices, the GATE supports the continuous development of research norms in response to rapidly changing research practices. We would like to discuss and explore how the GATE's dedication to the principles of open science can promote responsible, reliable, and innovative research practices. We would discuss the course for the future of OS training and research integrity with the participants in the discussion.

References: Heck, T., Scherp, G., & Weimer, V. (2025). Wrap-Up of the session "Bringing Open Science into action: The role of educating young researchers" at the EOSC Symposium 2024. EOSC Symposium 2024, Berlin, Germany. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13982666 Priess-Buchheit, J., Alavi, M., Müller-Karabil, A., & NERQ - Network for Education and Research Quality. (2025, Februar 11). Open Science Learning Gate. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14851846 Alavi, M., & Priess-Buchheit, J. (2024). The GATE Interim Report - May 2023 – December 2024 (Version 1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14549238

Definition of Assessment Criteria for Research Integrity Trainings and Materials: Experience from the NERQ Peer-Coaching Group

María Paula Paragis[1], Juliana Thomazini[2], Giulia Inguaggiato[3], Vinodh Ilangovan[4], Bert Seghers[5]

[1]Pompeu Fabra University, Spain

[2]Tilburg University, Netherlands

[3]Amsterdam University Medical Center, Netherlands

[4]Liebniz University, Germany

[5]Flemish Commission for Research Integrity, Belgium

Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) and Research integrity (RI) training varies greatly in interaction format, duration, learning goals, target group, curricular embedding, and resource use. In addition, trainers may have diverse disciplinary backgrounds and experience. Given this diversity, there is a need for tools to help trainers in the design of learning materials and lesson plans and to improve these trainings. To the best of our knowledge, two tools have been developed to assess RCR education, based on existing literature in regard with factors involved in the effectiveness of such training [1, 2].

Building on this work, as a special interest group of volunteers within the Network for Education and Research Quality (NERQ), we developed a rubric criteria tool that can be used for assessment or feedback of RCR/RI training (materials). We followed the categorization proposed by Krom & van den Hoven [2] and focused on how to assess (and ultimately improve) two aspects of an educational activity: the input, which refers to everything that feeds into the educational process (participants, learning aims and content, but also broader conditions like organizational support); and the process, in terms of characteristics of actual educational activities (e.g., the delivery format and specific teaching methods).

This talk will present the developed assessment criteria tool.

The NERQ special interest group on peer coaching in RI training was established following the identification of a need for safe spaces where RCR/RI trainers can share their insights and experiences, so as to provide feedback in a dialogical -and structured- way. We want to build a community of practice, with a bottom-up approach, in which trainers share experiences and learn from each other.

We aim to use the assessment tool in two activities of our NERQ group: as a guidance tool in shaping a “desk coaching” community, where trainers can share their materials and get feedback from peers; in on-site try-outs in which trainers can present a simulation of a training session and get immediate feedback from colleagues (the first one held in Ljubljana on September 22, 2025).

Ultimately, the aim of the NERQ peer coaching group is to foster the improvement of educational practices and promote a collaborative culture among RCR/RI trainers.

Acknowledgements: The authors thank the other members of the NERQ Peer Coaching group, for their feedback on an early draft of the tool, notably Michael Gommel, Susan Berentsen, Mariëtte van den Hoven, Victoria Kompanets and Agnieszka Dwojak-Matras.

[1] Mulhearn, T. J., L. L. Watts, E. M. Todd, K. E. Medeiros, S. Connelly, and M. D. Mumford. "Validation and Use of a Predictive Modeling Tool: Employing Scientific Findings to Improve Responsible Conduct of Research Education." Accountability in Research 24(4): 195–210. doi: 10.1080/08989621.2016.1274886. (2017) [2] Krom, A. & van den Hoven, M. A Quality Checklist for Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) Education: A proposal to complement the Predictive Modeling Tool, Accountability in Research, 29(1): 26-44, DOI: 10.1080/08989621.2021.1887736. (2022)

RCR training has no effect on European students' ability to handle grey-zones: results from a large scale survey across educational levels

Mikkel Willum Johansen[1], Mads Paludan Goddiksen[1], Christine Clavien[2], Linda Hogan[3], I. Anna S. Olsson[4], Peter Sandøe[1], P.J. Wall[3]

[1]University of Copenhagen, Denmark

[2]University of Geneva, Switzerland

[3]Trinity College Dublin, Ireland

[4]Universidade do Porto, Portugal

In this talk we seek to address two gaps in the current literature on academic integrity among high school and university students. First, while much research has been done on students' perception of and engagement in plagiarism and various forms of clear-cut cheating, grey-zone practices have been largely neglected. Second, comparisons across educational levels are rare, making it difficult to understand how students' integrity behaviours evolve throughout their educational trajectory.

To address this gap, we present results from a large-scale survey of 3,297 students from Denmark, Ireland, Portugal, and Switzerland [1]. The survey we conducted included and allowed comparison between three educational levels (upper secondary, Bachelor, and PhD students). Further, it was designed to examine the perception of and engagement in likely grey-zone and non-compliant practices, and to cover the following three dimensions of academic integrity: i) Plagiarism and citation practice, ii) Collaborative practices, and iii) Data collection and analysis.

Answers were analysed using descriptive statistics and regression analyses. Based on these results we will in the talk give a comprehensive overview of European students' conceptions of and engagement with academic integrity.

We found that participants at higher educational levels were generally better than those at lower levels at identifying likely non-compliant practices and were less likely to have engaged in such practices during their current studies. However, participants across all levels had a low level of competence in identifying grey-zone practices. The academic integrity training participants indicated they had received had some effect on their competence in terms of likely non-compliant practices, but it had no observable effect on their ability to identify likely grey-zone practices.

In the talk we will argue that these results call for a different approach to academic integrity training. In particular, they call for more comprehensive approaches that include grey-zone as well as non-compliant practices and address a broad range of questionable behaviours, not only plagiarism.

References [1]: Johansen MW, Goddiksen MP, Clavien C, Hogan H, Olsson IAS, Santos JB, Santos RA, Wall PJ, Sandøe P, Lund TB (in review): How do students' practices and conceptions of academic integrity vary across educational levels? A survey study from four European countries.

A Competence Grid for the Teaching of Good Scientific Practice

Roland Bluhm[1], Christian Dumpitak[2], Tina Rotzal[3], Lenka Schnaubert[4], Dominik Schuh[5]

[1]Saarland University, Germany

[2]Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf, Germany

[3]University Library Mainz, Germany

[4]University of Nottingham, United Kingdom

[5]Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Germany

It is widely acknowledged that training in Good Scientific Practice (GSP) should be provided to researchers from the beginning of their academic careers and continuously throughout. However, formats used to teach GSP differ widely in terms of their structure, content, duration, and the qualifications of the trainers. This diversity raises several questions: What levels of GSP competence are appropriate at different career stages? How can GSP courses be structured with curricular alignment in mind? How can different training formats be compared? And how can the qualifications of GSP trainers be assessed?

To address these questions, our working group developed a comprehensive competence grid. Drawing on our experience as GSP instructors, as well as the German Research Foundation's Code of Conduct [1] and other frameworks commonly used in German-speaking countries, we identified 18 subject areas and defined five levels of proficiency—each with detailed learning objectives. It has now been finalized and is ready for discussion and practical implementation. The competence grid can serve as a reference point for structuring GSP training, aligning it with different levels of expected proficiency, and assessing both training formats and trainer qualifications. This presentation will outline the grid's structure and highlight selected examples that demonstrate its scope and application.

[1] Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. (2025). Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice. Code of Conduct. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14281892.

Walking the talk about Open Science and Research Integrity in Greece

Panagiotis Kavouras[1], *Lia Ollandezou*[2]

[1]*Institute of Health and Society, Centre for Medical Ethics, Faculty of Medicine, University of Oslo, Norway*

[2]*HEAL-Link Office, Library & Information Center, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece*

Since January 2025 the first coordinated nation-wide effort, to raise the awareness of the Academic and research community on Open Science (OS) and Research Integrity (RI), has been taking place in Greece. This effort is being led by the Hellenic Academic Libraries Link (HEAL-Link), a non-profit organization, centrally funded by the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs of Greece (https://www.heal-link.gr/en/home-3/). HEAL-Link is comprised of 43 member-institutions, including the academic libraries of all Greek Universities and Research Centers, the National Library of Greece, and other key research-related institutions. Its mission is to unify all Greek academic and research libraries under a collaborative framework, enhancing access to global scholarly scientific information through publishers' agreements, supporting openness and data sharing, and offering services critical to the dissemination and sustainability of research outputs. This awareness-raising initiative is being delivered in the form of onsite seminars that conclude with an interactive session. The target audience is post-graduate students, researchers of all career levels, faculty members, librarians, and administrative staff of Greek Universities and Research Centers. The aims of the seminars are to provide basic knowledge on OS, RI, and Reproducibility, to inform about the ongoing efforts and existing tools that promote OS, RI, and Reproducibility in Europe and beyond, as well as to catalyse policies that incentivise good research practices and promote a research culture that builts societal trust in science. The seminars have kick-started in February 2025 from the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. By the time this abstract is written, 13 seminars in 10 different Greek Universities have been already planned and there are expressions of interest from other four Greek Universities. The aim of this work is to present the strategy HEAL-Link followed to attract attention on the seminars and the input gained from the participants, either in real time – in the form of questions posed or comments expressed during the seminars – or asynchronously – via the assessment forms that are being circulated after each seminar.

What does it mean to address power dynamics in research seriously?

Krishma Labib

Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Netherlands

Recently there is increasing emphasis on the importance of addressing power dynamics, and increasing diversity, equity and inclusion, among research integrity researchers and other stakeholders. However, the importance of these topics for research integrity is often also contested, with some stakeholders viewing research integrity as separate – and at times even conflicting – with such concerns. In this presentation, I will reflect on the tension between these two perspectives to explore whether, and if so how, power dynamics should be addressed within initiatives focusing on research integrity. I will argue that if research integrity is about doing good research, then power dynamics, and diversity, equity and inclusion, should be central considerations in all research integrity efforts. This is because power dynamics not only influence the healthiness of the culture of research, but also have an influence on biases - such as related to gender and race - in knowledge production which can compromise the integrity of research. I will then argue that most approaches currently only focus on power dynamics superficially (e.g. by focusing only on binary notions of gender, or junior researchers), rather than taking an intersectional approach that takes into account the political situatedness of research. More specifically, I will discuss that most research integrity initiatives in Europe usually ignore the entanglement of ongoing Euro-American colonialism with research. By refusing to see the systemic power structures that research institutions and researchers are situated in within a colonial, capitalist landscape, these research integrity initiatives then themselves become vectors of reproducing the coloniality in research. Two concrete ways they do this is by 1) prioritizing Eurocentric concerns about research, such as replication, above concerns such as epistemic injustice, and 2) imposing Eurocentric ideals about responsible research to other countries, thereby contributing to 'ethical imperialism'. I will end with a plea to the research integrity community to become aware of the entanglement of research integrity and power dynamics, in order to resist against rather than reproduce coloniality in research.

How precarity and denied academic citizenship experienced by early-career researchers endanger research integrity

Mirjam Heetkamp

Leibniz University Hannover, Germany

Universities promote themselves as democratic institutions educating young people as active, responsible and engaged citizens and preparing them for the work context. At the same time, each university itself provides a work context for their academic members, among them early career researchers.

Referring to the situation of researchers at academic institutions, the concept of 'academic citizenship' has been introduced. It is associated with membership, recognition and belonging to a specific academic institution, but in a broader perspective also with the service duties and responsibilities that academics have, both to their scientific communities and the society at large [1]. The working profile of a person highly influences the willingness and ability to participate in practices of democratic decision making. Economic, time-related, psychological, social, and mental aspects of the job (conditions) have a lasting effect on the ability to exercise democratic rights effectively [2]. Only a research environment which recognizes all its researchers as members and grants full academic citizenship to them, provides a solid foundation for research integrity and safe institutional culture.

But to what extend do academic institutions promote academic citizenship and provide spaces for justice, equality and inclusion for their youngest members - early career researchers? Early career researchers severely contribute to the well-functioning of universities. At the same time - as part of their academic socialization - it is commonly expected of them to be mobile and get to know various academic institutions to promote their careers. In Germany, 96% of early career researcher have a non-permanent working contract [3]. High mobility as well as non-permanent contracts foster precarious working conditions. These conditions highly affect the academic citizenship status of early career researchers, e.g. being granted less democratic rights and participation opportunities at the institutions. At the same time, being a vulnerable group, early career researchers are more severely affected by power abuse and role conflicts at their institutions.

This presentation aims at revealing the connection between denied academic citizenship of early career researchers and research integrity. Measures on how institutions can support academic citizenship of early career researchers will be presented and discussed with the audience to establish a safe research environment and full academic citizenship for all researchers.

References: [1] Sümer, S., O'Connor, P., Le Feuvre, N. (2020). The Contours of Gendered Academic Citizenship. In: Sümer, S. (eds) Gendered Academic Citizenship. Citizenship, Palgrave Macmillan Cham. [2] Honneth, A. (2023) Der arbeitende Souverän: eine normative Theorie der Arbeit. Berlin: Suhrkamp. [3] Konsortium BuWiK (2025): Bundesbericht Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler in einer frühen Karrierephase 2025. Bielefeld, wbv Publikation, 32.

Learning from psychiatry: A scripted expert interview about personality traits (narcissism, perfectionism...) and lessons for researcher assessment

Bert Seghers[1], ***Joeri Tijdink***[2]

[1]***Flemish Commission for Research Integrity, Belgium***

[2]***Department of Ethics, Law and Humanities, Amsterdam UMC, Netherlands***

It is often the talk of the academic town: the abusive behaviour of certain academic leaders, how they treat their subordinates, how they abuse their power and make decisions at costs of others and how they sometimes engage in questionable research practices. Interestingly, often these behaviours continue to exist, there is a fear to speak up because of potential repercussions, there are careers at stake and mostly early career researchers do not feel confident to discuss these issues. Many see personality as a crucial element in this. If we look at the evidence, some personality traits seem to be associated with higher ranks in academia, and one with self-reported misconduct. What are these character traits? How might they influence research quality or risk of cutting corners? Can we quantify their effect on work culture, like power abuse risks? Are these features (or behaviour patterns) shaped, because the science system moulds scientists to learn or develop them? Or are researchers with these character traits merely selected? How can research assessment policies take these findings into account, for the good of science?

Research data on this topic are scarce, but not absent.[1, 2] What we can know with high certainty is surpassed by the multitude of probable hypotheses experts may have on this topic. These perspectives may be valuable, (i) for coping with certain behaviours and personalities in the lab, and (ii) for the policies in research, especially in hiring, in assessment but certainly also in how we can teach early career researchers to empower themselves and step/speak up against these behaviours.

This duo presentation is planned as a semi-scripted interview by an interviewer (Bert Seghers) with an expert (Joeri Tijdink, who combines a degree and experience as a practicing psychiatrist, with a research interest in research integrity). Combining evidence with experience, we navigate answers to the abovementioned questions. And we unravel why we don't hear enough the stories of all those excellent leaders with responsible behaviours!

[1] Tijdink JK, Bouter LM, Veldkamp CLS, van de Ven PM, Wicherts JM, Smulders YM (2016) Personality Traits Are Associated with Research Misbehavior in Dutch Scientists: A Cross-Sectional Study. PLoS ONE 11(9): e0163251. doi:10.1371/ journal.pone.0163251 [2] Tijdink JK, Smulders YM, Bouter LM (2017) Publiphilia Impactfactorius: a new psychiatric syndrome among biomedical scientists? PeerJ Preprints 5:e3347v1 https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.3347v1

Systemic silencing of gender-based inequality at universities: launching an independent European NGO in Belgium and the first survey on retaliation

Bertanne Visser[1], Danièle Zucker[2], Urša Opara Krašovec[3], Jean-Pascale van Ypersele[4], Caroline Nieberding[4]

[1]ULiège, Belgium

[2]˝Harassment, Enquiry, Recommendation˝, Belgium

[3]University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Slovenia

[4]Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium

Risks for women and people associating to the female gender in academia have recently been quantified by the EU ("Unisafe" 2023; 1) and Belgium ("Behaves" 2024; 2), constituting power abuse, moral and sexual harassment, sexual aggression, as well as other forms of gender-based violence. What remains to be acknowledged openly is :

1) the systemic silencing of a large proportion of complaints associated to gender-based violence by the authorities of universities, and how this silencing is structurally organized through internal and legal procedures that targets must comply to (3,4,5).

2) How gender-based discrimination leads to misuse of large amounts of public money, like we experienced.

We first identify how silencing is organized by the academic institutions.

Second, as there is currently no organization in Belgium that is both financially and hierarchically independent of higher education institutions and the government, we present a novel international NGO that acts as an independent structure and focuses on advocacy, on data collection and on enforcement of non-discrimination by legal actions towards systemic change in higher education institutions, in Belgium, and in the long term in Europe. The NGO will develop strong ties with other networks to reach the following three main objectives:

1) provide support for individuals and groups encountering serious distress as a result of hostility, harassment, and violence in higher education and research environments;

2) conduct research to collect, analyse, publish, and disseminate data pertaining to barriers to women's progress and success in academia;

3) advocate for legislation change at the governmental and European level and provide a legal framework and support to enforce accountability of European academia. With this contribution, we want to highlight the current state of affairs in Belgian campuses focusing on retaliation mechanisms of targets by institutions, introduce our new NGO and present the launch of the survey for quantifying silencing and retaliation of gender-based violence by authorities of university institutions across Europe.

References: 1 https://unisafe-gbv.eu/outputs/ 2 https://www.student.uliege.be/cms/c_17774037/en/behaves-survey-on-well-being-harassment-and-discrimination-in-higher-education 3 Täuber, Susanne, et al. "Breaking the silence around academic harassment." FEBS letters 596.18 (2022): 2337-2344. 4 Sotirovic, Vilana P., Anke Lipinsky, Katarzyna Struzińska and Beatriz Ranea-Triviño. 2024. "You can Knock on the Doors and Windows of the University, but Nobody Will Care: How

Universities Benefit from Network Silence Around Gender-Based Violence." Social Sciences 13(4):199. 5 Hershcovis, M. Sandy, et al. "See no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil: Theorizing network silence around sexual harassment." Journal of Applied Psychology 106.12 (2021): 1834.

Power Abuse Trips in Research: What Fuels Them and How to Prevent Them

Irena Ograjenšek

University of Ljubljana, School of Economics and Business, and Faculty of Computer and Information Science, Slovenia

Given the empirical evidence presented and discussed in recent years, academia (in particular its research branch) can be, without any doubt, pronounced a fertile ground for different types of power abuse. Most of it seems to be carried out consciously and intentionally, with very different yet clearly identifiable goals. These are typically personal and range from achievement of direct personal gain to sheer spite or even harm brought upon disliked or disfavored individuals.

Although typically personal, most of these power abuse trips seem to be well hidden behind the veil of institutional agendas. In other words: individuals in a position of formal or informal power manage to find ways to embed their personal goals into institutional agendas with a complete disregard for any form of institutional loss (financial and non-financial). This is possible because many academic governance procedures seem to exist primarily in order to disperse personal responsibility and obscure personal liability.

In this paper we take a closer look at different types of power that fuel the power abuse trips. Three of them deserve special attention: reward power, coercive power, and gossip power. Reward power is demonstrated by an individual's capacity for provision of favorable assignments, financial compensations, promotions, media appearances, and similar to achieve individuals' compliance. Coercive power is defined as the use of confrontations, verbal threats, and punitive actions to force individuals' compliance. Finally, gossip power (universally recognized as one of the most destructive forces in any organization) is wielded by spreading toxic rumors with the goal of ruthlessly killing individuals' reputation; the social death of the target individuals being an anticipated and wished-for consequence.

After reviewing different types of power that fuel the power abuse trips, we turn out attention to ways and means of power abuse trips prevention. We identify several platforms (e.g. legislative, social, health, or media) and numerous hierarchical levels (ranging from supranational, national, industrial, institutional, departmental, to individual) which could be and have been used in the power abuse prevention processes with varying rates of success. We also point out ways and means in which these very platforms and hierarchical levels could and have been misused as tools for further victimization of victims.

Throughout the paper we build on a set of research vignettes based on real-life first-hand experiences of researchers with the goal of facilitating an open discussion of this difficult and very sensitive topic.

Hilfe! Help! Au secours!: How to Handle Transnational Cases of Research Misconduct

Markus Seethaler[1], Sabine Chai[2], Tom Lindemann[3], Malte Fischer[4]

[1]Austrian Student Ombuds Office at the Federal Ministry of Women, Science and Research, Austria

[2]Austrian Agency for Research Integrity, Austria

[3]Luxembourg Agency for Research Integrity (LARI), Luxembourg

[4]Ombuds Committee for Research Integrity in Germany, Germany

For research integrity officers and other actors tasked with investigating cases of alleged research misconduct, transnational cases may not be a daily concern. However, when they do occur, their complexity will likely be higher due to conflicts over jurisdiction, differing laws and regulations regarding investigative procedures, and decreased access to case-relevant information. Also, as the number of publications resulting from international collaborations keeps increasing (OECD, 2022), the likelihood of misconduct occurring in such collaborations can be expected to increase at a similar pace. How can people responsible for processing misconduct allegations be supported in navigating these complexities? Although important existing guidelines are transnational in scope (e.g., ALLEA Code, 2023) and set forth widely agreed upon principles of research integrity, they do not give practical, operational recommendations on investigations. Based on an in-depth analysis of 88 case investigations, our working group "Orientation on Transnational Case Investigation" consisting of national agencies and institutional RIOs identified issues specific to transnational cases (Chai et al., 2024). We, for example, identified differing definitions of relevant terminology, differences between (or absence of) national laws, institutional regulations, and responsible bodies, varying responsibilities and competencies of involved bodies, and variations in the handling of confidentiality issues.

Objectives

Based on the issues identified, the working group now including representatives from Austria, Germany, Luxembourg and Switzerland set out to (1) develop a practical, step-by-step guide and supporting material for actors involved in investigating transnational cases related to these four countries and (2) set up an infrastructure to share and disseminate our key outputs.

Method

In an exploratory first phase, a comprehensive list of questions that arose during the investigation of transnational cases was created by each group member and then entered into a question-bank. In the course of a two-day work session, three sub-groups each sorted the questions into logical sequences. These sequences underwent intense discussion and were then merged into a flow-chart depicting the structure of a misconduct investigation and the corresponding questions. At this point, two separate working groups were formed, one to complement the questions with answers and a second to develop appropriate channels for distribution.

Results and Conclusion

We will be presenting the flow-chart of issues and concerns to be considered in the course of a transnational investigation of alleged research misconduct together with the material developed to provide guidance for actors in the field of research integrity. We will also present the online support structure including information hubs and network and are hoping for a lively discussion and possible broadening of our working group.

How transparent should institutions be about research misconduct?

Signe Mežinska, Elīza Lasmane

University of Latvia, Latvia

Background. The requirement for transparency in investigating research misconduct is supported by ethical principles outlined in the ALLEA European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. Reliability ensures the quality of research through transparent investigations that prevent errors and reveal the truth. Honesty involves conducting misconduct investigations with integrity and truthfulness. Respect entails treating all parties involved in investigations with dignity and fairness, ensuring impartiality and justice. Accountability holds individuals and institutions responsible for their actions, demonstrating commitment to ethical standards through transparent processes.

Methods. The study utilized a public consultation approach involving two methods: an anonymous online survey with multiple-choice and open questions, and semi-structured interviews. The survey was aimed at three groups: those directly involved in research practice, students, and the general public and was completed by 205 participants from 32 countries. Additionally, 31 semi-structured interviews were conducted. Interviews were transcribed verbatim and analysed using Atlas.ti.

Results. For the question "How transparent should an investigation of research misconduct cases be?" participants provided a broad range of views. In general, respondents emphasized the fundamental value of transparency and its positive implications for investigations of research misconduct cases, e.g., they suggested publicizing investigation reports, at least in the form of executive summaries, to drive up standards and change mentalities within the research community. However, respondents directly involved in research were more cautious, advocating for a nuanced approach to avoid negative consequences such as increased mistrust in science or unfair presumptions of guilt. They highlighted the need for transparency for involved parties while protecting the accused to prevent undue harm. Several interviewees emphasized that transparency is crucial for building and maintaining public trust in science and the investigative process. They advocated for institutions to be transparent about research misconduct cases to demonstrate a commitment to ethical standards and enhance accountability. Potential solutions offered by participants included a tailored and proportionate approach, depending on the case, while respecting the public's right to be informed. Some participants suggested separating the investigation process from its results, with limited publicity during the investigation to protect the work of investigators and broader transparency for the results.

Conclusions. The results indicate that while transparency is fundamentally valued for its positive implications, a balanced approach is necessary to avoid potential negative consequences such as mistrust in science or unfair presumptions of guilt. Reflective equilibrium can be used to find the right level of transparency by iteratively balancing the diverse views of stakeholders with ethical principles.

Acknowledgements. BEYOND project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under GA No 101094714

Annulment of Higher Education Diplomas – Terms and Conditions in Cases of Academic Integrity Violations

Dace Raipale, Sanita Osipova

University of Latvia, Latvia

Academic integrity is a fundamental value in higher education, ensuring both the quality of education and public trust in higher education institutions. However, cases occasionally arise where individuals have obtained diplomas through dishonest means. This presentation aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the conditions under which a higher education diploma may be annulled, the criteria considered, and the process for evaluating each case individually. The scope of the research includes European democratic countries, with comparative examples from three states.

A higher education diploma certifies an individual's knowledge, skills, and competencies in a specific field of study. Its annulment is an administrative penalty that may be applied following an assessment of the following factors.

1) Time Since Obtaining the Diploma. The period that has elapsed since the diploma was issued is a significant factor. The longer the time, the more challenging it may be to prove the violation and the stronger the legal reliance of the individual on the diploma.

2) Legal Reliance. Whether, in a given case, the individual has developed a legitimate legal reliance on the diploma.

3) Awareness of the Violation. It is essential to determine whether the academic dishonesty was intentional or occurred due to negligence or ignorance.

4) Proof of Guilt. The annulment of a diploma must be based on proven academic dishonesty. The presumption of innocence must be upheld, and the burden of proof lies with the institution making the annulment decision.

5) Effect of the Decision – Retroactive or Prospective. It must be assessed whether the annulment should take effect retroactively or prospectively. A retroactive annulment may have significant negative consequences for the individual, whereas a prospective annulment may be a more proportionate solution in some cases.

6) Principle of Proportionality. The annulment must be proportionate to the violation and its consequences. It should be considered whether alternative, less severe penalties could be equally effective.

7) Legal Certainty and Stability. The higher education system must maintain legal certainty and stability. Excessive or arbitrary annulment of diplomas could undermine public trust in the education system.

Considering these factors, the decision to annul a higher education diploma due to academic dishonesty must be made on a case-by-case basis, carefully evaluating all relevant circumstances while ensuring compliance with the principles of legality and proportionality. Such decisions must not be automatic but should be based on an objective and thorough investigation, with the right to appeal.

The research is financed by the Recovery and Resilience Facility project "Internal and External Consolidation of the University of Latvia" (No.5.2.1.1.i.0/2/24/I/CFLA/007)

Shared Responsibility to Address Questionable Research Practices? – A Study of Perceived Efficacy of Organisational Research Integrity Policies

Simon Fuglsang[1], Serge P.J.M. Horbach[2], Mads P. Sørensen[1], Niels Mejlgaard[3]

[1]Aarhus University, Denmark

[2]Radboud University, Netherlands

[3]Danish National Resaerch Foundation, Denmark

In response to widespread concerns about research integrity, recent years have seen numerous efforts to safeguard against research misconduct and questionable research practices. Such efforts have taken many forms and have been implemented at all levels of the research systems. Among the key actors involved in implementing such efforts are research performing organisations. These play a significant role in designing, implementing, and enforcing research integrity policies for the researchers they employ. However, while much effort has been put into designing organisational research integrity policies, little is known about the effectiveness of these in changing researcher behaviour. To inform the discussion about the effectiveness of these policies, this study investigates the ability of organisations to change researchers' behaviour through the perspective of the researcher.

We do so by analysing data from the International Research Integrity Survey (IRIS), a survey of researchers in Europe, Canada, Australia, and the USA, collected as a part of the SOPs4RI project. This dataset includes survey responses from more than sixty thousand active researchers who answered questions about their experiences with and views on research integrity. Participants were sampled from a list of all identifiable authors in publications between 2016 and 2020 indexed in web of science.

To analyse the impact of organisational research integrity policies, we investigate whether researchers' perceptions of their organisations' research integrity policies relate to the degree to which they engage in questionable research practices. Results show that awareness of polices, evaluations of the effectiveness of policies, as well as confidence in their organisations' research integrity policies all relate to lower levels of engagement in questionable research practices. However, we also find that this relationship is highly sensitive to both researchers' research integrity self-confidence and their general attitudes towards research integrity. As such, we find substantial evidence that individual and organisational levels interact in forming researcher behaviour. We interpret this as evidence that organisations' policy efforts can influence researcher behaviour, but that this influence is contingent on researcher acceptance and empowerment.

Beyond approval: experiences and lessons from constructing research ethics review

Marjo Rauhala

Unit of Responsible Research Practices, TU Wien, Austria

Since 2020 the TU Wien has piloted and then formalized research ethics review in response to the growing need for researchers to obtain research ethics review for their research. Currently the TU Wien Research Ethics Committee (TUW REC) focuses on human research participation in minimal risk, non-invasive research activities involving healthy volunteers. The study authors that approach the committee include engineers and researchers recruiting participants for interviews studies, workshops, observations and prototype trials. This presentation will introduce the consultative and dialogue-based approach to research ethics review, its background, and some of the benefits and challenges from the perspective of the ethics committee reviewers and researchers who have participated in the review process. In addition, some observations on individual competence and institutional capacity building and lessons learned will be provided.

The primarily consultative focus of the university's research ethics committee grew out of necessity and opportunity. With little institutional experience in formal research ethics, the reviewers themselves had to be trained for the task before the committee could be established. Strengthening the research ethics responsibilities of researchers was considered important in the design of the review process, as members of the research community as a whole were relatively unfamiliar with the research ethics requirements for human research participation. In addition, the awareness-raising and educational effects of the committee were considered important. The lack of prior research ethics review structures, or even a legal requirement to establish such structures in the Austrian context, provided an opportunity for methodological experimentation almost starting from scratch.

The review process was designed to avoid the misconception that the committee is absolving researchers of responsibility or merely serving as a rubber stamp for approval. In addition, the idea that all ethical issues could be identified and addressed at the outset of research was challenged in the design. Finally, care was taken to minimize any negative connotations associated with ethics review. In this way, the committee has sought to be accessible, attentive, and sympathetic, thereby promoting researchers' responsibility and contributing to an open and safe research environment. The committee's commitment to a supportive attitude is conveyed by its slogan, "Caring rather than clearing."

The pilot process resulted in a review method that enables direct engagement with ethical concerns in researchers' work, strengthens researchers' responsibilities to their research participants, and focuses on improving research by facilitating the integration of research ethics by design.

Bad apples in which barrels?

Sara Belfrage, Jonas Åkerman

Stockholm University, Sweden

Explanations for the occurrence of various kinds of misconduct often point to “bad apples” (individuals prone to cut corners) as well as “broken barrels” (organisations that through acts or omissions encourage unethical behaviour). This applies more specifically to research misconduct and other deviations from good research practice, as reflected in ethics and integrity codes and guidelines, like the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (the ALLEA Code), as well as in regulations, like the Swedish law on responsibility for good research practice and assessment of research misconduct.

It is certainly true that research performing organisations have an important role to play in the advancement of good research practice; the ALLEA Code lists a number of obligations, including promoting awareness of and creating incentives for research integrity, ensuring the availability of training opportunities in research integrity, and providing infrastructures necessary for adequate generation, management, and protection of data and research materials (see sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the ALLEA Code). A separate section in the ALLEA Code is devoted to the important role of handling misconduct and other deviations from good research practice within the organisation. But when this is to be implemented in practice, a crucial question is: What are the criteria for determining whether or not something has been done within a certain organisation? Or to exploit the metaphors above: What determines whether a certain apple belongs to a certain barrel?

The idea of allocating specific tasks to certain designated actors in the process of handling and following up on suspected deviations from good research practice is not unreasonable, but its workability in practice requires that the organisational home of the research can be determined. And while this is often the case, there are also cases where standard clues like stated affiliation and employment are not sufficiently clear or point in the wrong direction. Indeed, unclarities may even be expected to be more common in cases where there is reason to suspect deviations from good research practice.

In this presentation we will show how problems in specifying the institutional belonging of research and researchers may undermine the purpose of parts of well-intentioned research integrity and ethics systems. They may, for instance, lead to complications due to overlapping responsibilities, or worse, to situations where no one is responsible for certain crucial measures, like investigation or informing stakeholders. The overall consequences may be negative for the appropriate handling of individual cases as well as for the functioning of the system as a whole. We will focus on examples from the Swedish context, but we will also discuss the issues and possible solutions more generally.

Integrity Meets RAISA: The Harmonious Fusion of Human Ethics and AI Efficiency in Scholarly Excellence

Kerstin-Kathy Meyer-Ross

HTW Dresden, Germany

In an era where artificial intelligence (AI) is reshaping the landscape of academia, the principles of integrity and ethical responsibility remain paramount. This paper explores the dynamic interplay between human intellect and AI efficiency through the lens of RAISA (Read by Human - AI Summarize - Added by Human), a novel reading technique designed to harmonize the strengths of both. RAISA begins with human engagement, leveraging traditional reading strategies such as active reading and critical analysis to capture the nuances of a text. AI then steps in to summarize the material, enhancing productivity and scalability. Finally, human oversight ensures depth, accuracy, and alignment with ethical principles, safeguarding the integrity of the process.

By integrating the HEXACO model of personality, which emphasizes sincerity and fairness, and drawing on established reading techniques like SQ3R (Survey, Question, Read, Recite, Review), RAISA exemplifies how technology can amplify human capabilities without compromising moral and intellectual rigor. This paper argues that the future of academic and professional work lies in collaborative models like RAISA, where human judgment and AI efficiency coexist to drive innovation while upholding the ethical foundations of scholarship. Through this balanced approach, we can navigate the challenges of the digital age, ensuring that technological advancements enhance, rather than diminish, the quality and trustworthiness of scholarly endeavours.

[1] Lee, K.; Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO Personality Inventory. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 39(2), 329-358. DOI: 10.1207/s15327906mbr3902_8 [2] Duke, N. K.; Pearson, P. D. (2002). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. Journal of Education, 189(1-2), 107-122. DOI: 10.1598/RRQ.37.1.2

Ethical AI in Academic Research: A Novel Course Model for Upholding Research Integrity and Embracing Institutional Responsibility

Hong-Ly Nguyen, Kerstin-Kathy Meyer-Ross

HTW Dresden, Germany

The rapid evolution of AI technologies has transformed higher education, disrupting traditional pedagogical practices and challenging the integrity of academic writing. While AI tools streamline the research and writing process, their unregulated use poses significant risks, including the potential for biased algorithms, opaque attribution, and the erosion of research integrity. As AI becomes an integral part of academic work, universities face a critical responsibility to equip students with the knowledge and skills necessary to navigate this new landscape ethically and responsibly. This paper addresses a fundamental question: How can AI tools be ethically and responsibly integrated into academic writing to foster research integrity? A novel course model, "Scientific Writing with AI," was developed at HTW Dresden, which aims to balance the efficient use of AI in research with the need to uphold rigorous ethical standards. This pioneering course integrates AI-assisted writing with a strong focus on the ethical considerations that accompany the use of these technologies.

The course is designed to cultivate AI literacy among students while fostering a critical understanding of the ethical implications of AI in academic research. It encourages students to evaluate AI-generated content critically, ensuring proper attribution and addressing the risk of plagiarism. Through a combination of theoretical lessons and practical applications, the course emphasizes the prevention of misuse, such as plagiarism, and promotes awareness of AI's limitations, such as inherent biases in algorithms.

One of the key outcomes of this course is the development of responsible AI use and an enhanced commitment to research integrity. Students are taught not only how to use AI tools effectively but also how to engage with them critically, identifying potential risks and addressing them proactively. Post-course surveys show increased emphasis on ethical practices, with students prioritizing proper citation, and transparency in AI use. The importance of disclosing AI involvement increased significantly, from 2 mentions out of 28 students prior to the module to 15 mentions following its completion. This paper also discusses the importance of institutional responsibility in promoting research integrity through education. Universities must establish clear guidelines for the ethical use of AI in academic writing, ensuring that students understand how to responsibly incorporate AI tools into their work. HTW Dresden's initiative exemplifies a forward-thinking approach to this challenge, offering a replicable model for institutions worldwide.

In conclusion, the course presents a proactive solution to the challenges posed by AI in academic research. By embedding ethical AI use into the curriculum, higher education institutions can foster a generation of researchers who view integrity and innovation as interdependent. This model offers actionable strategies for balancing the adoption of AI technologies with a commitment to ethical accountability, ensuring that research integrity remains a cornerstone of AI-assisted academic work.

Beyond Guidelines: Using the Anthology Format for Mediating AI-related Research Ethics

Hallvard Fossheim, Thomas Østerhaug

National Committee for Research Ethics in Science and Technology, Norway

Developments in the field of AI have led to a great demand for guidelines and guides for research on AI and the use of AI in research. Many institutions, journals, and funders are developing their own guidelines for what is and is not acceptable use of AI.

The national research ethics committees in Norway are advisory bodies for research ethics/research integrity. The National Committee for Research Ethics in Science and Technology (NENT) has developed and updated research ethics/integrity guidelines for its subject areas since 2007.

For an ethically demanding topic like AI, however, guidelines should do only part of the job of helping stakeholders to develop sustainable practices and make responsible choices. Guidelines work best in tandem with other efforts. An anthology is a tool that, if developed correctly, plays an important part in securing these ends by supplementing the functions served by guidelines.

In the talk, we will present the ongoing work on an anthology on AI and research ethics. "Research ethics" is here understood broadly, so that it includes good scientific practice, responsibility for individuals and groups involved in or affected by research, and responsibility for how the knowledge developed is utilised in society and in relation to nature. The talk will address the central parallels and contrasts in terms of complementing strengths and weaknesses of guidelines and anthologies. Among them are

• Complexity. While guidelines can work well to articulate basic principles, they require a great amount of experience, imagination, and judgment in order to be properly implemented in the complex reality of AI. A well-crafted anthology can alleviate such situations by addressing the complexity directly – being of real help through providing examples, analogies, and discussions of paradigmatic approaches for which there is no room in a set of guidelines.

• Room for problematizing. Guidelines normally are of limited help when it comes to seeing how to handle situations where no available solution is optimal, and all options include some unwanted consequences or risks that are typically part and parcel of dealing with new technologies. A suitable contribution to an anthology can get to the centre of such challenges.

• Accessibility. Well-designed guidelines typically score highly on accessibility, in that they convey important points with a limited amount of text. Also, they are accessible in the sense that they are usually not behind payment walls, something that is of special importance for a field like AI research carried out by agents from a wealth of institutional frameworks. For an anthology to maximise accessibility, besides being Open Access-based, there is a need for short, succinct contributions that are clearly defined in terms of their more specialized topic.

Who should create AI guidelines for researchers? – a research integrity perspective

Katrin Frisch

Ombuds Committee for Research Integrity in Germany, Germany

Artificial intelligence is here to stay and it is increasingly being used by researchers for their work [1, 2]. A recent Wiley survey [3] showed that researchers '[w]hen asked what barriers or obstacles were preventing them from using generative AI in their work to the extent that they'd like, 63% selected a lack of clear guidelines and consensus on what uses of AI are accepted in their field'. But which actors are (or should be) primarily responsible for creating such guidelines?

Since generative AI (genAI) became accessible to researchers, many different actors have issued policies and guidelines: research performing institutions, publishers and editorial associations, funders and even the European Commission [e.g. 4, 5, 6, 7]. This has resulted in a heterogeneous landscape of regulations with consensus on some issues, but different approaches and interpretations of others. Moreover, with the development of AI tools being in constant flux there is a risk of some regulations becoming obsolete before their usefulness for research integrity can be assessed in practice. At the same time, some researchers are wary of overregulation or guidelines that are not compatible with actual use of AI in research practice.

In this presentation, I will look at the different actors who set up AI policies and guidelines in order to address questions such as: Who set up AI policies? Which perspectives are still missing? And who should create AI guidelines for researchers? I will compare existing regulations from different actors with researchers' needs and actual use of AI (as reported in the literature and from many discussions I had with different groups of researchers). I will also share insights from the Ombuds Committee of Research Integrity in Germany and our work on developing AI recommendations. The aim of this presentation is to facilitate a discussion on what regulatory guidelines researchers need to ensure they can use AI in line with research integrity.

[1] Elsevier, 2024 [2] Oxford University Press, 2024 [3] Wiley, 2025 [4] Helmholtz, 2024 [5] WAME, 2023 [6] DFG, 2023 [7] European Commission, 2024

Writing Assistant, Workhorse, or Accelerator? Insights from a Nationwide Survey on Researchers' Use of Generative AI and their need for guidelines

Mads P. Sørensen[1], Jens Peter Andersen[1], Lise Degn[1], Rachel Fishberg[1], Ebbe K. Graversen[1], Serge P.J.M. Horbach[2], Evanthia Kalpazidou Schmidt[1], Jesper W. Schneider[1]

[1]Aarhus University, Denmark

[2]Radboud University, Netherlands

This presentation reports on a nationwide survey study that explores the use of generative AI (GenAI) and research integrity assessments of various use cases [1]. The survey was conducted in 2024 and was sent to all researchers based in Denmark. The study received 2,534 responses from researchers (including PhD students). It evaluated 32 GenAI use cases across five research phases: idea generation, research design, data collection, data analysis, and writing/reporting. Respondents reported on their own and their colleagues' GenAI usage. They also assessed whether the practices in the use cases were considered good research practice.

Through an explorative factor analysis, we identified three clusters of perception: "GenAI as a workhorse", "GenAI as a language assistant only", and "GenAI as a research accelerator". The findings further show varied opinions on GenAI's research integrity implications. Language editing and data analysis were generally viewed positively, whereas experiment design and peer review tasks faced more criticism. Controversial areas included image creation/modification and synthetic data, with comments highlighting the need for critical and reflexive use of GenAI.

The study further showed that GenAI usage differs by main research area, with technical and quantitative sciences reporting slightly higher usage and more positive assessments. Junior researchers used GenAI more than senior colleagues, while no significant gender differences were observed.

The study underscores the need for adaptable, discipline-specific guidelines for GenAI use in research, developed collaboratively with experts to align with diverse research practices and minimize ethical and practical misalignment.

[1] Andersen, JP; Degn, L; Fishberg, R; Graversen, EK; Horbach, SPJM; Schmidt, EK; Schneider, JW; Sørensen, MP. Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in the research process – A survey of researchers' practices and perceptions, Technology in Society, Volume 81, 2025. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2025.102813

Roles and functioning of the European Union National Ethics Councils (NEC): a cross-sectional study

Zvonimir Koporc[1], *Lisa Diependale*[2], *Edyta Sikorska*[2], *Livia Puljak*[1]

[1]*Catholic University of Croatia, Croatia*

[2]*European Commission, DG Research and Innovation, Ethics & Research Integrity Sector, Belgium*

Background: In an increasingly globalized and technologically dynamic landscape, National Ethics Committees (NECs) play a crucial role in navigating the complex ethical challenges posed by emerging technologies.

Aim: This study examined how European Union (EU) NECs address those challenges by analyzing their composition, functioning, financing, independence, and influence on policy decision-making.

Methods: We conducted a cross-sectional study targeting the EU NEC registered in the European Commission (EC) system Synapse. The survey covered eight thematic categories for NECs, with the additional questions aimed at council members, staff, and representatives.

Results: Responses were received from NECs of 23 (85%) of the 27 EU countries. Findings revealed high heterogeneity in organizational procedures across EU NECs. Some legal act safeguards their independence, and most operate without a formal obligation to consult governmental bodies before issuing opinions. Their positions generally cannot be revised by external entities. However, despite being tasked with advising the government, parliaments, and public institutions, only a few NECs held formal roles in legislative processes. Additionally, the study highlights persistent financial constraints and operational challenges of EU NECs.

Conclusion: This study underscores the need for enhanced harmonization and support of EU NECs to strengthen their operational capacity and expertise, especially in addressing ethical dilemmas associated with technological advancements.

Promoting Research Security through Research Ethics and Integrity practices

Vasiliki Mollaki, Xenia Ziouvelou, Konstantina Giouvanopoulou, Vangelis Karkaletsis

Institute of Informatics and Telecommunications, National Centre for Scientific Research ˝Demokritos˝, Greece

Collaborative and open research combined with influential technological advancements and geopolitical tensions allow Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and Research Performing Organisations (RPOs) to become prone to Research Security (RS) risks. Despite its recent conceptualization, RS has been swiftly recognized as a critical issue globally. Building upon existing guidance, it is necessary to adopt policy actions relatively quickly without creating new structures and by avoiding excessive procedural compliance.

To this direction, the CHANGER consortium recommends policy actions integrating RS considerations with research culture of ethics and integrity, to build resilience to malign foreign interference, while ensuring freedom and openness of research:

• Policy Action 1: Establish a common understanding and promote RS as a shared responsibility within the research ecosystem.

• Policy Action 2: a. Develop training on RS through research ethics and integrity programs, and provide relevant funding and, b. Cultivate professional expertise in RS.

• Policy Action 3: Support research on innovative approaches fostering capacity building in RS.

Concluding remarks. Leveraging experience and insights from research ethics and integrity infrastructure offers valuable opportunities to raise awareness and establish procedures for safeguarding RS. The proposed policy actions offer flexibility to meet specific research needs of each HEI and RPO, and are proportionate to related risks rising from each research project. They respect the autonomy of HEIs and RPOs and protect freedom of research. By fostering capacity-building for researchers and cultivating a culture of awareness, shared responsibility, and proactive responsiveness, the responsible internationalization of research can be effectively realized.

Acknowledgements All authors were supported by the EU project CHANGER under Horizon Europe agreement No 101131683.

Upholding scientific integrity in climate change in the R&I system

Janina Bau[1], Lorenzo Molina[1], Teodora Konach[2]

[1]EU Projects Officer and Research Analyst, Belgium

[2]European Association of Research Managers and Administrators, Austria

RE4Green is a three-year project funded by Horizon Europe aiming to develop an encompassing framework supporting the transition to a sustainable economy and society. The project aligns with the goals of the European Green Deal and will incorporate recommendations on an ethical, sustainable framework for researchers. To achieve this, RE4GREEN establishes social labs across various thematic areas, including health; culture and inclusive society; civil security; digital, industry and space; climate and mobility; energy; agriculture; and water. These labs serve as collaborative spaces for co-creation, fostering dialogue among diverse stakeholders to generate knowledge and ethical guidelines for green research and innovation.

One of the key outputs of the project is the development of several policy recommendations, including one on strategies to uphold the integrity of scientific research in addressing climate change issues through policy instruments. These policy recommendations are being co-created with a diverse group of stakeholders within the social labs and will explore the balance between ethical research practices and economic growth. The ENRIO Congress would offer the opportunity for a wider dissemination of the RE4Green project allowing participants to explore the interconnection of ethics and a sustainable framework as well as its direct impact on policy development. The policy recommendations currently being developed will also consider issues related to equality, equity and diversity. Early findings from RE4Green highlight growing disparities between low-income and high-income countries in terms of accessibility to sustainable technologies and resources, exacerbating challenges such as climate-induced droughts, water scarcity, food insecurity, and socio-economic instability. Vulnerable groups including women, marginalized communities, and people with disabilities are disproportionately affected. The report launched at COP28 by UN Women warns that by 2050, climate change could push up to 158 million more women and girls into poverty, reinforcing the urgent need for inclusive climate policies (Berninger, 2024).

Sharing these insights at the Congress will enhance the visibility and impact of the RE4Green Project, fostering meaningful discussions that can inform future research practices and policymaking. This submission aligns with ENRIO's mission to advance research integrity by engaging a broad community of experts in a dialogue that bridges ethical considerations and sustainable development. A dedicated Q&A session will encourage further exchange of ideas, ensuring an interactive and collaborative discussion beneficial to both the project and the wider research community.

Enhancing Research Integrity Training: The BEYOND Trainer Guide

Daniel Pizzolato[1], Erika Lofstrom[2], Anu Tammeleht[2], Giulia Inguaggiato[3], Josephina Antoniou[4]

[1]EUREC, Germany

[2]University of Helsinki, Finland

[3]Amsterdam University Medical Center, Netherlands

[4]UCLan Cyprus, Cyprus

In recent years, the European Commission has made substantial investments in projects aimed at strengthening responsible conduct of research. This effort has led to the development of comprehensive training programs and resources designed to equip both researchers and trainers with essential knowledge and skills.. Initiatives such as VIRT2UE, Path2Integrity, INTEGRITY and ENERI have played a crucial role in shaping these educational materials, which are freely accessible for immediate use.

Despite the wealth of available resources, tailoring training materials to different career stages and competence levels in remains a challenge. To address this, the BEYOND project has developed a Trainer Guide to provide practical guidance for teaching research ethics and integrity to diverse audiences, including students, early-career and senior researchers, and research ethics and integrity experts and trainers.

The development of the BEYOND Trainer Guide involved a thorough analysis of existing educational resources. An initial draft was discussed in a co-creation workshop with developers of the presented materials and relevant stakeholders. Subsequent drafts underwent multiple review rounds before the guide was finalized and published in its current version. The BEYOND Trainer Guide aims to disseminate existing training resources and equip trainers with the knowledge, strategies, and resources necessary to create engaging, insightful, and transformative learning experiences. It is designed to enhance trainers' skills while allowing flexibility in adapting content to their audience. The pedagogical approaches promoted in the Trainer Guide are research-based and include cases, collaborative approaches, scaffolding techniques, and feedback. Furthermore, it presents examples of potential implication of using artificial intelligence tools in training. Structured from a pedagogical perspective, the guide guides trainers from design to evaluation. First, it outlines how to develop teaching strategies and aligns them with intended learning outcomes. Second, it provides strategies for utilizing existing training materials, including those developed within EU-funded projects. Third, it provides guidance on how to select appropriate material and effectiveness measurement tools and lastly, it offers examples of tailored training resources designed to address various career stages—such as students, early-career researchers, and senior professionals—as well as different levels of expertise in research ethics and integrity.

By facilitating the adaptation of training materials, the BEYOND Trainer Guide represents a valuable tool for fostering high-quality research integrity training tailored to diverse audiences. By offering structured guidance, adaptable resources, and pedagogical strategies, it empowers trainers to create meaningful and impactful learning experiences.

Increasing reproducibility through the co-creation of interventions that support a transparent and trustworthy research ecosystem-TRUSTparency project

Panagiotis Kavouras, Rosemarie de La Cruz Bernabe

University of Oslo, Norway

TRUSTparency project (trustparency-project.eu) is based on the assumption that scientists need to trust the process of organised scepticism, which facilitates the self-correction of scientific knowledge. By extending this assumption we argue that scientists, as well as all other actors that form the research enterprise, should be open to adopt innovative interventions, as long as these are developed, deployed, assessed, and corrected transparently and collaboratively. TRUSTparency's core guiding principle clearly reflects the above argument, specifically by advocating for a maximally informed, context-sensitive, collaborative, democratic, and transparent approach for the development of interventions that promote reproducibility in Research Performing Organisations, Research Funding Organisations, learned societies, and publishers. These types of institutions will be empowered to develop their own policy guidelines in the form of a Reproducibility Promotion Plan (RPP), which will be a sequence of concrete steps to transfer the practices that promote reproducibility to their everyday work and to monitor their effectiveness with mechanisms customised to their specific needs. TRUSTparency will follow a three-stage co-development plan of the project's interventions: (a) development, (b) pilot testing by 9 institutions, and (c) validation-finalisation. The project's co-creation activities will be applied in tandem with a wide and structured discussion facilitated by the highly innovative comCensus platform and by a Mutual Learning Exercise on reproducibility that will bring together TRUSTprency and the global Federation of national Reproducibility networks. In addition, TRUSTparency will establish a Reproducibility Community and invite all stakeholders with stakes in fostering reproducibility to join through an open call distributed via the professional networks.

Research Ethics Committees in Technical Universities: Challenges and Insights

Aive Pevkur

Tallinn University of Technology, Department of Business Administration, Estonia

In contemporary scientific research, ethical assessment is crucial for maintaining societal trust and protecting human dignity, the environment, and scientific integrity. The scope of research requiring ethical review has expanded, and research ethics committees (RECs) at universities, also known as institutional review boards (IRBs), play a more important role than ever. However, studies indicate that IRBs face common challenges across institutions and countries [1,2,3]. Less attention has been given to how a university's research focus influences its ethics committee's composition, challenges, and responsibilities.

While ethical assessment of research projects is often conducted at the national level in many European countries, more universities are establishing their own RECs. Traditionally, ethics committees emerged to evaluate biomedical research, leading to their long-standing presence in universities conducting such studies. In contrast, technical universities have been slower in establishing RECs. The study in 2014 [4] found that most technical universities do not employ ethics committees for human studies, and IRBs have only recently been introduced in such institutions. This shift is driven by the expanding definition of human research and technological advancements, particularly in AI. Tallinn University of Technology added research ethics assessment to its academic ethics committee's responsibilities in 2019.

This presentation examines the challenges faced by a recently established ethics committee in a technology-focused university on an example of Tallinn University of Technology. The focus of the committee is on non-medical research and general research integrity, as biomedical projects are reviewed on the national level. Nevertheless, the number of IRB applications is increasing.

Institutional ethics committees in technology universities face multiple challenges. A key issue is defining their role within the national research ethics system. Ensuring interdisciplinary representation is difficult, as many fields have limited prior experience with ethics reviews. Methodological differences across disciplines further complicate processes. Creating foundational documents and support materials is necessary but requires ongoing adaptation. Additionally, because committee members are appointed by faculties for limited terms, knowledge transfer and ongoing training are essential.

Emerging external factors, such as advancements in generative AI, add complexity to ethical considerations.

The presentation explores how Tallinn University of Technology's REC has addressed these challenges and what other universities can learn from this experience.

[1] Edwards, S. J. L., Stone, T., & Swift, T., Int. J. Technol. Assess. Health Care 23, 17 (2007). [2] Abbott, L., & Grady, C., J. Empir. Res. Hum. Res. Ethics 6, 3 (2011). [3] Li, D., Ethics Behav. 35, 1 (2024). [4] Koepsell, D., Brinkman, W.-P., & Pont, S., J. Empir. Res. Hum. Res. Ethics 9, 67 (2014).

Updating the UK Concordat to Support Research Integrity: Modernising to Embed Good Practice and Increase Alignment across the Research System

Rebecca Veitch[1], Anne Taylor[2]

[1]UK Research and Innovation, United Kingdom

[2]Wellcome, United Kingdom

Since 2012, the UK has used the Concordat to Support Research Integrity ('the Concordat') as the main framework which unites expectations around practice for those conducting research, governing it, and funding it. It originally set out four principles for working in the research system and encouraged adherence to these through a set of responsibilities aimed at researchers, employers and funders. In 2019 the Concordat was updated to reflect changes to the system and opportunities raised by the UK's House of Commons Science and Technology Select Committee, adding a fifth principle: accountability.

In 2024 the Concordat signatories began a process for refreshing the Concordat. This presentation will guide participants through the process and describe how the Concordat has changed. The focus of the refresh was to i) ensure it remained relevant in changing times and supported continual improvement; and ii) increase accessibility of the document and reduce repetition so that members of the research community could more easily engage with it. It was not about revisiting the five principles which are well embedded across the system.

The presentation will highlight the Concordat's connection to other frameworks as part of efforts to build upon and support good practice worldwide. The presenters will consider how responsibilities within the UK system can support European expectations, enabling high integrity practice internationally and across disciplines, and serving as an example when needed for systems looking to improve their approach to building good practice.

This will consider how the responsibilities set out in the Concordat support behaviour that leads to trustworthy research. People working across the UK's system were invited to participate in consultation opportunities on the Concordat refresh in 2024, providing key input on how/where strengthening the wording in the Concordat would help improve practice. This work highlighted how there is not a great separation in responsibilities across the different groups: in order for their to be progress, everyone must work together towards the same aims.

Finally, the presenters will reflect on their experience as part of the working group to refresh the wording in the Concordat, considering the time and effort involved in the process. They will discuss what they have learned, which will guide and inform future development of the Concordat and its implementation.

Acknowledgements: The presenters wish to acknowledge the other signatories of the Concordat who all participated in the refresh, and the UK Committee on Research Integrity which chaired the review process and now hosts the Concordat. Our appreciation goes out to the members of the research community who participated in the consultation exercises and replied to the online survey, providing key feedback on where the Concordat could be strengthened or improved.

Handling alleged research misconduct across Europe: a comparative overview of national systems

Lodewijk Pet, Yvonne Erkens, Frits Rosendaal

Leiden University, Netherlands

Introduction
European countries address research misconduct allegations through diverse frameworks, although most share core principles like honesty and accountability. These variations include differences in procedural structures, oversight entities, definitions of misconduct, and whistleblower protections, factors that can complicate cross-border collaborations and raise fairness and trust concerns. We aim to create a comprehensive overview of how scientific misconduct is handled across Europe, comparing similarities, highlighting discrepancies, and exploring ways to enhance research integrity through mutual learning.

Methods
We collected publicly accessible documents, including national research integrity guidelines, institutional policies, and relevant legal statutes, and organized the data into 61 fields (e.g., appeals procedures, investigative bodies, definitions of misconduct, whistleblower protection, and transparency requirements). Where data were incomplete, we plan to contact Research Integrity Officers via email or online interviews, enabling a detailed depiction of each country's system.

Results
Preliminary data from 44 countries show that every country has ways of handling alleged research misconduct, going back to as early as 1992. Among these, 70% have an internal appeals committee, while 30% have no formal mechanism beyond the initial decision. Judicial appeals are possible in 93% of countries, though about 7% report such cases are rarely pursued. Around 32% have a national body for appeals, while 68% rely on institutional or judicial routes. Regarding who can appeal, 52% allow both the accused and the complainant to challenge rulings; 23% permit only the accused; and a small number include the institution or leave the matter unspecified. Around 55% operate a hybrid system (mixing institutional autonomy with national oversight), 41% have a decentralized model, and 5% are centralized. Half the countries define misconduct broadly (covering Fabrication, Falsification, Plagiarism, plus questionable practices), 41% focus on FFP only, and 9% lack a formal definition. Roughly 30% explicitly distinguish between serious misconduct and lesser questionable practices, while 36% make no such distinction, and 34% only allude to it. About 36% provide clear, legally backed whistleblower protections, whereas others only mention basic safeguards or omit them entirely. Half publish anonymized national statistics on cases annually, while the remaining half do not. Confidentiality requirements vary: 45% enforce strict confidentiality, and 9% do not mention it.

Implications
These findings illustrate differences in how European countries define misconduct, conduct investigations, manage appeals, and oversee the process at the national level. By refining these observations with input from Research Integrity Officers, we aim to clearly compare diverse approaches. Identifying both commonalities and points of divergence can facilitate dialogue, support international collaborations, and highlight strategies that could enhance fairness and trust in European research integrity frameworks.

Research integrity is also for the private sector! Early lessons from an ongoing initiative in France

Romain Pierronnet

French Office for Research Integrity, France

While public policies in support of research integrity are mainly geared towards academia and public research sector, research and innovation in the private sector are also expected to comply with the same requirements. This is particularly the case as public authorities seek to strengthen the private sector's involvement in research, in close partnership with public research, as reflected in the concepts of the Knowledge Economy and Innovation Triangle. In France, where private sector R&I expenditure accounted for 65.8% of gross domestic spending on R&D (GERD) in 2021 [1], Ofis (French Office for Research Integrity) has taken steps to roll out initial actions aimed at private companies. In this communication, we propose to report on the initial lessons learned from this approach.

We will first present initial reflections arising from the work of Ofis with regard to private R&I. We will present the stakeholders identified for our initiative, the contacts we have met and the initial initiatives taken among them. In particular, we will show that without challenging the requirements of research integrity, the tactic used is based on taking into account the specific characteristics of the economic world (issues, vocabulary, etc.) as well as the benefits of relying on public support mechanisms for private R&I.

More specifically, working on the French "Crédit Impôt Recherche" (CIR - Tax Credit for Research) scheme is a promising lever for addressing the issues of research integrity in the private sector. Indeed, while it represented €6.9 billion in 2021 [2], the effectiveness and relevance of the CIR is the subject of much debate, with its detractors fearing a windfall effect, as some companies are tempted to pass off activities that are not research in order to benefit from tax exemptions. In this context, scientific integrity is a welcome reinforcement for better understanding the demarcation between what does and does not fall under the scope of research. This approach can thus prove useful for public authorities, as well as for companies for whom research integrity makes it possible to clarify the standards expected of sincere and high-quality research activities.

[1] "La dépense de recherche et développement expérimental en 2021", French Ministry for higher education & research (2023) [2] "Le CIR en 2021 (données provisoires)", French Ministry for higher education & research (2023)

From 2015 to 2023, eight years of empirical research on research integrity: A scoping review

Baptiste Vendé

OFIS and Sorbonne Université, France

Research on research integrity (RI) has grown exponentially over the past several decades. Although the earliest publications emerged in the 1980s, more than half of the existing literature has been produced within the last five years. Given that the most recent comprehensive literature review is now ten years old, the present study aims to extend and update previous findings.

We conducted a systematic search of the Web of Science and Constellate databases for articles published between 2015 and 2023. Additionally, we used the previous scoping review as a benchmark to identify emerging trends and shifts. To structure our overview, we addressed the following seven questions about the field:

- What topics does the empirical literature on RI explore?

- What are the primary objectives of the empirical literature on RI?

- What methodologies are most prevalent in the empirical literature on RI?

- What populations or organizations are studied in the empirical literature on RI?

- Where are the empirical studies on RI conducted?

- Where is the empirical literature on RI published?

- To what degree is the general literature on RI grounded in empirical research?

Our search yielded a total of 3,282 studies, of which 660 articles met our inclusion criteria. Notably, we observed a significant shift in methodologies: the reliance on interviews and surveys decreased from 51% to 30%, whereas the application of meta-scientific methods increased from 17% to 31%. In terms of theoretical orientation, the previously dominant “Bad Apple” hypothesis declined from 54% to 30%, while the “Wicked System” hypothesis correspondingly increased from 46% to 52%. Furthermore, there has been a pronounced trend toward testing solutions, rising from 31% to 56% at the expense of merely describing the problem, which fell from 69% to 44%.

Two gaps highlighted eight years ago by the previous scoping review remain unresolved. Research on decision makers (e.g., scientists in positions of power, policymakers, accounting for 3%) and the peer review system (0.3%) continues to be underexplored. This study found a third gap, as the low number of research on the private research sector and patents (4.7%) is also concerning. The gaps on decision on makers and the private sector are increasingly problematic. The rise of the “Wicked System” hypothesis put heighten importance on the decision makers. The private research sector is roughly three times larger than the public research sector [1] and current dynamics to bring closer the private sector and universities create the risk for RI research to lose in relevancy if it does not take more into account the private research sector.

[1]. OECD, OECD Publishing 2023, Volume 2022 Issue 2, (2023).

Good academic practices of Ukrainian universities

Ülle Must[1], *Stella Shapoval*[2]

[1]*Archimedes Foundation, Estonia*

[2]*Directorate for International Cooperation of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, Ukraine*

Ukraine has been a full member of the Bologna Process since 2005 which aims to harmonize various systems of European higher education, including academic integrity which is declared to be a fundamental value together with academic freedom in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). The so-called Revolution of Dignity in 2014 gave a real impetus to the practical introduction of ethical values in higher educational institutions. The question undoubtedly arises - how have Ukrainian higher education institutions coped with the effects of the war which started in 2014 and escalated into full-scale war on February 24, 2022? What is the impact of the war on Ukrainian universities in their efforts to establish ethics and academic integrity practices at their universities?

Analysis of legislation, literature and documents from this period shows continuous development, which is also confirmed by the results of the research conducted.

In September, 2017, the Law of Ukraine "On Education" entered into force, which introduced and formalized the types of violations of academic integrity (academic plagiarism, self-plagiarism, fabrication, falsification, writing off, deception, bribery, biased assessment), the formation of concepts of academic ethics is enshrined in the laws of Ukraine "On Higher Education", "On Copyright and Related Rights" and "The Law of Ukraine on Academic Integrity". The adoption of Code of Ethics (under different headings – Code of Academic Integrity, Code of Ethics, Code of Honour and Corporate Ethics, Code of Professional Ethics and Conduct, even Corporate Ethics, etc.) at universities started mainly in 2017. In parallel, joint projects began, supported by different donors (American Councils for International Education, British Council, and European Commission). The most large-scale of which were: a) Strengthening Academic Integrity in Ukraine, SAIUP (2016-2019), b) The Academic Integrity and Quality Initiative, Academic IQ (2020-2022). c) Ukraine Higher Education Leadership Development Programme (2016-2019); d) False Records, Altered Diploma and Diploma Mills Qualifications Collection, FraudS+ (2020-2022), and e) Open Practices, Transparency and Integrity for Modern Academia, OPTIMA (2021-2025). When comparing the results of different projects, we can confirm that, above all, general awareness and understanding of academic honesty has increased in Ukraine. It seems that the war has even put pressure on it – there are no other alternatives but to integrate with the European educational space.

Acknowledgements: The authors gratefully acknowledge support from Development Cooperation Project No. 76-2021-A of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Estonia.

Perceptions of Ethical Breaches and Consequences: Results from the National Lithuanian Survey in Academia

Rima Sinickė

Office of the Ombudsperson for Academic Ethics and Procedures, Lithuania

This presentation highlights the results of a Lithuania national applied survey conducted among academia (lecturers, researchers, administration, doctoral students) from universities, applied universities, and research institutes.

Method and organization of the survey. A quantitative method – an online survey – was chosen to collect the data. The survey was conducted online between December 2024 – February 2025. A total of 725 respondents participated in the survey. This study does not rely on prior theoretical research or literature, as the findings are derived directly from the survey. This presentation covers analysis of twelve questions out of forty-eight, specifically focusing on aspects of how people from academic perceive different ethical breaches and their possible consequences.

Results. Respondents were presented with seven statements ("A researcher falsifies data and publishes them in a journal", "A higher-status individual (e.g., a professor, supervisor) demands to be included as an author in a student's publication despite not contributing", "A colleague is added as an author despite not contributing to the publication", "A student cheats during an exam", "A researcher conducts a study without the necessary bioethics committee approval", "A researcher publishes multiple papers from the same study data"), which they had to evaluate on a scale from "not a problem" to "serious violation". For example, 68% of respondents considered the demand by a higher-status person to be included as an author without contribution a serious violation and 67% considered as a serious violation a student cheating during exams, while "gifted authorship" was chosen as a serious violation by 50% of respondents. The least ethically problematic issue was publishing research data in multiple different publications, which 44% of respondents considered a minor ethical violation (half of them regarded it as "entirely insignificant").

Respondents were also given five hypothetical scenarios and asked how each situation should be handled. For example, in one scenario, they had to decide what actions an institution should take if a researcher was found to have falsified study data and published them in a scientific journal. Response options ranged from 'dismissal' to 'internal investigation without escalation'.

Conclusions: The study shows that the academic community takes data falsification, unfair authorship, and cheating in exams seriously. Most respondents believe that researchers who falsify data should face disciplinary actions or even lose their jobs, while unfair authorship should be discussed and addressed within the institution. Opinions on bribery during exams vary—small gifts are seen as less serious, but giving money gets a much stricter reaction. Respondents' opinions vary on how strict the punishments should be and how to address different academic ethics breaches.

Law and Order for RI?: Research Integrity Governance in Austria on the Move

Sabine Chai, Eva Korus

Austrian Agency for Research Integrity, Austria

How do we ensure that research is conducted according to the highest standards of quality and integrity? Countries and research communities usually strive to accomplish this through a mix of laws, and national, regional or institutional regulations and soft-law guidelines. These may be historically grown and, therefore, not necessarily systematic and well-coordinated. How does the mix of issues governed by laws and through self-regulation mechanisms of the research community influence the research integrity landscape and what does it mean for research integrity processes and practices? Through the introduction of a section on research integrity in the Act on Quality Assurance in Higher Education (HS-QSG) in 2024, Austria has become a showcase for possible effects of juridification of research integrity concerns. Before 2024, Austria had one soft-law guideline for Good Scientific Practice issued by the Austrian Agency for Research Integrity (OeAWI) on which its member institutions had agreed. In addition, institutions either had their own guideline or just referenced the OeAWI guideline. Finally, the Universities Act 2002 (UG) prohibited ghostwriting and plagiarism, making these the only two types of research misconduct included – at least for higher education institutions – in law. Although not completely logically consistent, this set-up focused on self-regulation of the research community and institutions. In 2024, the government updated the laws governing higher education institutions, most notably the HS-QSG. The section on research integrity now includes a definition of integrity for education, teaching, and research (at education institutions), the requirement to foster a "culture of integrity", and a definition of good scientific and good artistic (!) practice as the adherence to legal regulations, ethical norms and the state-of-the-art expectations of one´s field. The section further includes as research misconduct not just plagiarism and ghostwriting but now also sabotage of research or artistic activities of others, the use of unauthorized aids (e.g., AI tools), and the fabrication and falsification of data. Finally, the law requires institutions to include more details on integrity, good practices, and processes and sanctions regarding possible misconduct in their regulations.

This new law has already set a number of developments and debates in motion. First, what is artistic integrity and good artistic practice? Although meant to provide visibility to non-research, art-focused degrees at universities of music and the arts, the law has created a term the meaning of which is hotly debated. Second, what will the juridification of large parts of existing research integrity guidelines mean for responsibility and competence to both facilitate good practices and process cases of misconduct? We will present an update on consequences and developments.

Protecting Research from Foreign Interference: Risks and Challenges from the Lens of the French Office for Research Integrity

Nathalie Voarino, Romain Pierronnet

French Office for Research Integrity, France

In France, research integrity (RI) and research security (RS) have until now been addressed separately – involving different actors and different control and prevention mechanisms at national and local level. During the last ENRIO congress (2023), the presentation of the OECD report on Integrity and Security in the Global Research Ecosystem by C. Smith raised a number of RS issues that could affect RI. Something relatively new, that have been perceived as a 'wake-up call' for the RI community according to the reaction of one participant.

The French Office for Research Integrity (Ofis) has since been conducting prospective work to better understand how RS overlap with RI, particularly through the prism of foreign interference in science. The aim is twofold:

1) Investigate whether the various forms of foreign interference pose a risk to RI, i.e. the extent to which foreign states or third parties are likely to hinder the reliability of results and the proper functioning of research communities;

2) Determine Ofis' area of action in response to these risks, by mapping the scope of the current RS framework and identifying potential gaps in the protection of RI.

We analysed the grey literature, looking in particular at official reports (at European and French level) and cases reported in the press. We also conducted exploratory interviews with national and local stakeholders in RS. At this stage of our work, we have identified the following:

First, foreign interference constitutes a risk for RI. To illustrate this, we propose a typology of three forms of threat to the research community (RC). 1) The RC can be deceived (honest researchers may spread false results or information without noticing it); 2) the RC can be discredited (e.g. by disseminating false information about research results or researchers); and 3) the RC can be coerced or very strongly influenced (e.g. intimidation or political pressure that may lead to self-censorship).

Secondly, there are gaps in the current RS framework with regard to the protection of RI. The public authorities have mainly focused their efforts to protect research on the very high risks of capturing knowledge and expertise (e.g. for nuclear proliferation and terrorism) and disciplines with a technological dimension (e.g. with potential military applications). However, other disciplines - particularly in the social sciences - are also affected, even if the risk is lower in terms of the global Nation's security.

Given the current geopolitical context, we believe that these risks are likely to increase. As well as giving shape to C. Smith's warning, we believe this communication can be useful to other RI offices. It also invites the RI community to focus on how to work with the RS community and respond to foreign interferences while preserving academic freedom.

Experiences from the first five years of the National Board in Sweden

Sofia Bergström, Magnus Eklund, Dorota Green, Magnus Gudmundsson

Npof., Sweden

Since January 2020, research misconduct has been a legal matter in Sweden. Reported allegations of fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism (ffp) are since then investigated and assessed by a national governmental authority: The National Board for Assessment of Research Misconduct (Npof). Other allegations of research misconduct are assessed locally by the employer of the accused researcher, e.g. a University or a healthcare provider, like before. Part of the Boards assignment is to produce a yearly report where the statistics and short accounts of all the ffp allegations handled by the Board, and other allegations handled by the local employers, are presented. In our presentation, we will give an overview of the experiences presented in the reports from the first five years since the law came into effect.

Ethical implications of power dynamics in the recruitment of young people in school settings

Tamara Trošt

University of Ljubljana, School of Economics and Business, Slovenia

It is well-established that researchers must pay attention to potential power dynamics when recruiting subjects for research: university professors recruiting their own students, bosses disseminating surveys to their employees, doctors soliciting participation in a medical study from their own patients, etc. At the same time, youth are considered a vulnerable population for research purposes, and as such, research including young participants generally undergoes additional scrutiny in the ethical review process [1]. When research involves both potential power dynamics and includes youth, which is frequently the case because multiple gatekeepers are involved in providing consent -- schools, teachers, counsellors, and/or parents -- the situation becomes even more complex. Previous research has shown that researchers working with youth frequently have to make a series of ethical compromises in order to fulfil the requirements of the many gatekeepers involved in research with youth [2] [3]. This paper highlights two main ethical implications of power dynamics when using young people as research participants: a) considerations of (in) competence of young people in providing free and informed consent, including the implications of enforcing a standard legal age of consent; and b) power dynamics during recruitment (e.g. involvement of parents, teachers, counsellors; and peer pressure) and the effect of these power dynamics not only on youth's ability to provide informed consent, but also on the results of the research study. When examining these considerations, I focus on the age group of 14-20, as countries and institutions/ethics boards differ in their considerations of age required to give consent (without parental approval) for participation in particular kinds of research, generally requiring parental consent forms for ages up to 16, but providing different definitions of when youth are considered legally competent to give their own independent consent. I reflect on the literature from social psychology and sociology on the effects of power dynamics on youth's decision-making, questioning the established practice of using age-cut-offs for informed consent, and instead advocating for a more holistic understanding of the potential effects of power dynamics on the ethical nature of the research.

[1] Schmid, E., & Garrels, V. (2025). Ethical Pitfalls in Research with Young People: How Can They Be Identified and Addressed?. Sage Open, 33(1), 56-71. [2] Lenton, L. A., Smith, V., Bacon, A. M., May, J., & Charlesford, J. (2021). Ethical considerations for committees, supervisors and student researchers conducting qualitative research with young people in the United Kingdom. Methods in Psychology, 5. [3] Singh, S., & Wassenaar, D. R. (2016). Contextualising the role of the gatekeeper in social science research. South African Journal of Bioethics and Law, 9(1), 42-46.

Authorship conflicts between supervisors and PhD students – Findings from a recent survey in Germany

Nele Reeg

Ombuds Committee for Research Integrity in Germany, Germany

National codes of conduct to foster good research practice not only include criteria for authorship, but also clarify that so-called honorary authorship (being listed as author without fulfilling the respective criteria) constitutes a breach of research integrity. In Germany, this holds true for the "Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice" of the German Research Foundation [1] which have to be implemented by German research performing institutions as a requirement for receiving funding. Notably, these guidelines emphasize that merely holding a leadership or supervisory position does not constitute a sufficient criterion per se for claiming authorship on emerging publications.

Nevertheless honorary authorships are routinely the subject of enquiries handed in at ombuds offices in Germany as our recent survey amongst local ombudspersons conducted by the discussion hub project at the Ombuds Committee for Research Integrity in Germany shows [2]. More specifically, the survey underlines that frequently PhD students indicate that their supervisors seem to violate authorship guidelines and to use their position of power to claim unjustified authorship. Furthermore, conflicts between supervisors and PhD students are not limited to the question of honorary authorship, but also concern other contentious topics such as allocating the appropriate authorship position or handling changes of the byline in a fair manner. Moreover, as our survey reveals, many PhD students refrain from mediation, only asking for counselling, when they reach out to ombudspersons.

In my talk, I will present these results of our survey in more detail discussing also other factors making mediation in conflicts between PhD students and their supervisors for ombudspersons more challenging. In this context, I will address different dependencies PhD students are potentially subject to and which might facilitate power abuse by supervisors, in turn affecting the work of ombudspersons addressing such cases. By doing so, I not only intend to point out frequent problems and characteristics in such conflicts, but also aim at moving the debate forward on how to handle and prevent those in order to foster research integrity.

[1] German Research Foundation (2019) [2] Katrin Frisch and Nele Reeg, Zenodo (2024)

Diversifying Philosophy with Methods from the Social Sciences

Dilara Diegelmann

University of Bonn, Germany

The history of academic philosophy as well as current gatekeeping practices in hiring, funding, publishing, and teaching show how philosophy, like many other academic disciplines, has been and continues to be affected by and reinforce various societal and global power dynamics [1]. Diversifying the discipline by integrating previously neglected voices and perspectives can be seen as a way to combat epistemic injustices and discrimination in academia, to promote research integrity as well as very fruitful and inspiring for philosophical discourses. Apart from diversifying the group of academic philosophers, the question arises how to diversify the content of philosophical discourses or the 'canon'. To address this question, I take the sub-discipline of environmental ethics as an example to argue that philosophy could benefit from more empirical approaches from the social sciences.

While the discipline is obviously still not as diverse as would be ideal, there have been many efforts in environmental philosophy to include indigenous perspectives because of the special and deep connection of indigenous peoples to their natural environment [2]. Including references to any indigenous group has become "the thing to do" in environmental philosophy in order to show one's progressiveness. But in many cases, still predominantly white environmental philosophers use aspects of indigenous knowledge only as an aside. In many cases, white environmental philosophers engage with canonical figures like Hegel and then simply add a brief remark like "just like a Dakota proverb says ...". How can non-indigenous environmental philosophers learn from indigenous communities and respectfully incorporate indigenous perspectives on the environment into their work?

I argue that if we want to diversify the philosophical 'canon', apart from supporting people from marginalized groups in our ranks, we should learn from different philosophical traditions, not only by using secondary literature about them, but by engaging personally and practically with the people who hold these wisdoms, in ways similar to participatory research in the social sciences. A prerequisite for self-critical and anti-discriminatory research practices is transparency about one's own position as a researcher. In both respects, we can learn from the social sciences in how they have responded to criticism of their methodologies and methods, and how many social scientists are now trying to make their research less hierarchical, less colonial, more respectful, reciprocal, and fair. As an example, I will use Barbara Schellhammer's research [3], which combines her expertise in social work with her philosophical inquiry.

[1] Silva, G. J., South. J. Philos. 57 (2019) [2] Errico, S., The rights of indigenous peoples in Asia (2017) [3] Schellhammer, B., polylog 42 (2019); 44 (2020)

Unequal Burdens: Power, Gender and the Impact of Covid-19 on Women in Academia

Giulia Inguaggiato[1], Claudia Pallise Perello[1], Petra Verdonk[1], Pamela Andanda[2], Mariette van den Hoven[1], Linda Schoonmade[3], Natalie Evans[1]

[1]Amsterdam UMC, Netherlands

[2]University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa

[3]Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Netherlands

The Covid-19 pandemic has acted as a stress test for existing institutional and societal structures, exposing and intensifying deeply rooted power imbalances. In academia the crisis has exacerbated and revealed pre-existing inequalities; women researchers have been disproportionately affected, not simply due to individual circumstances, but as a consequence of structural inequalities embedded in the academic system. This study systematically scopes the qualitative literature on the experiences of women researchers during the Covid-19 pandemic, interrogating how they navigated and responded to the crisis.

The analysis reveals how gendered power structures operating at the intersection of institutional expectations, household responsibilities, and socio-demographic positionalities, have exacerbated existing inequalities in the academic system. Increased unpaid and paid care responsibilities, often rendered invisible and undervalued, and consequential loss of research time have significantly hindered women's professional advancement. These effects are not uniform but are determined by intersecting factors such as parenting status, employment precarity, and socio-economic background, demonstrating how multiple axes of inequality converge in crisis contexts.

Three overarching themes emerged from the synthesis: gendered professional expectations, conflicting identities, and coping strategies. These themes highlight the gendered allocation of academic labour, particularly the disproportionate expectation that women engage in care, teaching, and service work. These forms of labour are essential to the functioning of academia, especially in times of crisis, yet remain undervalued and unrewarded in the dominant research assessment system. Such practices reflect and reinforce hierarchies of power that prioritize measurable outputs and individual achievement, while devaluing relational and collective forms of academic labour.

The study reveals that these gendered dynamics contribute to feelings of alienation and burnout among women researchers, who are often caught between institutional demands and societal gender normative expectations. In this context, coping strategies are not merely personal acts of resilience but also reflect broader negotiations with power within an inequitable system.

The current division of labour in academia reflects gendered power dynamics that operate both within academic institutions and the broader social context. These dynamics are reinforced by research assessment criteria that prioritize productivity, often perpetuating structural (gender) inequalities. Meanwhile, essential yet undervalued tasks such as pastoral care, teaching, and service work remain critical to the functioning of academic systems, particularly during times of crisis. To foster greater resilience in these systems, it is crucial to recognize and support those who take on, or are assigned, these indispensable tasks. This includes making mentoring. education and pastoral care work explicit, valued, and rewarded responsibilities for all academics. Additionally, shifting institutional priorities to value team-based contributions over the individualistic pressures of the 'publish or perish' model can help create a more equitable academic environment.

Abuse of Power as Breach of Good Research Practice – Towards an Integration of Power Abusive Behaviors in Research Integrity Guidelines

Katharina Beier[1], Sophia May[2], Britta Anstötz[3], Valerie Boda[4], Maria Melms[5], Carmen Schüler[6]

[1]Ombuds Office for Good Research Practice, University of Göttingen, Germany

[2]Ombuds Committee for Research Integrity in Germany, Germany

[3]Coordination Office for Research Integrity, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany

[4]Office for Good Scientific Practice and Ethical Principles, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany

[5]Office of Ombudspersons, Leipzig University, Germany

[6]Ombuds Office, University of Hamburg, Germany

In recent years, awareness of power abuse in academia has been rising in Germany — largely driven by high-profile cases that received extensive media attention, but also by reports. In this context, universities and other research institutions are criticised: institutional structures are seen as enabling or encouraging abusive behavior, while the investigation and sanctioning of power abuse is often perceived as insufficient, slow and lacking transparency. In addition, it is not clear which bodies are — or should be — responsible for investigating potential cases of abuse of power in the academic sphere.

Germany's national Code of Conduct "Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice" (German Research Foundation (DFG) 2019) to which virtually all research institutions are committed, emphasises the need to prevent abuse of power and the exploitation of dependency relationships through appropriate organizational measures. This suggests that abuse of power can also constitute a breach of the rules of Good Research Practice (GRP). However, the DFG's Code of Conduct does not specify which power-abusive behaviors qualify as research misconduct. Given our capacity as advisors on GRP, we are regularly confronted with allegations of power abusive behaviors and therefore argue for the development of a GRP-specific definition. This would help objectify and assess research-related power abuse and provide ombudspersons in academia with a clearer basis for addressing potential cases — while also delineating the boundaries of their responsibilities.

To this end, we first propose a working definition of power abuse tailored to the academic context. Second, we outline systematic considerations — derived from existing GRP regulations — on how abuse of power might be conceptualized as a violation of the rules of GRP.

While our focus is on the German context, we seek to engage with stakeholders across Europe to explore whether and, if so, how power abuse might be addressed and (where appropriate) sanctioned as a form of research misconduct within other national GRP frameworks.

Acknowledgement: These considerations were developed as part of a working group of the Network of Research Integrity Offices in Germany.

The LORIER program at Inserm: a tool for fostering a culture of ethical and responsible research in the health research community

Catherine Coirault[1], *Boczkowski Jorge*[2], *Nathalie Théret*[1], *Ghislaine Filiatreau*[1]

[1]*Inserm, France*

[2]*Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris, France*

Excellence and trust in health research are closely linked to the scientific integrity of the research community. In this context, national and institutional initiatives to promote scientific integrity are essential. In France, Inserm (Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale) supports scientific integrity. The Delegation for Scientific Integrity (Inserm RIO) was created in 1999 and is a founding member of Enrio (2008) and the French RIO network Resint (2016). Since 2021, Inserm has launched a new program called Lorier, the French acronym for Organizing the Inserm for Fostering Ethical and Responsible Research. This initiative is a key component of the Strategic Plan 2025 signed with the Ministry, with the overall objective of fostering an ethical and responsible research culture. The scope of LORIER encompasses not only scientific integrity, but also ethical considerations, deontology, reproducibility, open science, research quality, and responsible research, including societal expectations, environmental concerns, and gender dynamics.

The Lorier program proposes to develop four lines of action: i) Integration of ethical and responsible behavior in all activities of the institution, including recruitment of researchers, evaluation of researchers and laboratories, communication, training, etc. ii) Creation and maintenance of a web portal (https://lorier.inserm.fr/en/) for the permanent availability of resources and services and for collaborative work. iii) Access to scalable training courses. iv) Animation of a community of scientific actors mobilized around networks of ambassadors and key partners to question research practices and generate knowledge on how to improve their effectiveness, relevance, reliability, equity and impact.

Since its creation, the web portal has encouraged everyone to share news and announcements on a weekly basis, regular webinars on ethical and reproducible research topics (https://lorier.inserm.fr/webinaires/). An anonymous survey on the wishes of all participants in international programs on “research of research” (e.g. OSIRIS and Share CTD - see https://lorier.inserm.fr/en/asking-questions/meta-research-projects/) has been launched, and the Open Science initiatives are promoted. Finally, Lorier promotes the ambassador network of people involved in ethical and responsible research “on the ground” (https://lorier.inserm.fr/en/getting-involved/ambassador-networks/).

Interestingly, the visibility provided by the Lorier program has generated fruitful interactions between the Inserm RIO and the various departments of the institution, including human resources and research evaluation departments, but also with universities that are interested in - or still involved in - similar initiatives.

In conclusion, the Lorier program is expected to play a pivotal national role in enhancing the perception of the quality and reliability of the research produced by the institution and its partners.

The 3R Principles in laboratory animals experiments and the necessity of a fourth R

Ilja Richard Pavone

National Research Council of Italy, Italy

In their seminal work of 1959, The Principles of Humane Experimental Technique, Russell and Burch introduced the 3Rs in animal experimentation (Replacement, Reduction and Refinement). It is an ethical framework that must address scientists when use animals in experiments and it was 'codified' in the EU Directive 2010/63/EU. One of the major bioethical issues regarding experiments on animals is related to the duplication of experiments and unnecessary experiments; in few words, a lack of respect of research integrity principles. The integrity of research results is related to the fact that the welfare of animals is well cared for throughout the research process. The aim of this paper is to discuss the possibility to add a fourth R, namely responsibility of researchers and scientists, that must avoid any form of research misconduct during experiments on animals and must strive to uphold the highest standards of animal welfare and avoid unnecessary research or studies that have already been conducted elsewhere. Against this backdrop, I will assess existing literature on this topics and will analyze legislative reforms. For instance, the Max Planck Society, after the well-known Tübingen scandal, related to the misuses of primates in research, has already introduced a fourth R (Responsibility), related to the fair conduct of scientists and researchers.

Ethical implications of using AI in healthcare research

Daniela Proske, Sandra Scholl, Dirk Lanzerath

University of Bonn, Germany

The Horizon Europe project irecs focuses on AI in healthcare as one of four new and emerging technologies. Through various scientific methods, such as a literature analysis, consultation with experts, a leadership roundtable and a focus group, several fundamental ethical challenges were identified as well as problems in review processes. [1] The identified ethical challenges include data-related issues such as privacy, security, bias, accuracy, ownership, control-related issues and informed consent. Other concerns that are specifically associated with the use of AI, involve transparency and explainability regarding AI algorithms and learning mechanisms. Additionally, impacted social values and related ethical and legal issues such as trust, justice and fairness as well as autonomy, accessibility and inclusivity, human dignity and environmental impact, were highlighted.

A major issue is the lack of expertise among REC members to assess AI-related research adequately, which can lead to overly cautious evaluations or the overlooking of essential ethical considerations. Such gaps threaten to undermine public trust and the credibility of research institutions [2].

Furthermore, current EU guidelines for assessing AI in healthcare research are often non-binding and only provide recommendations. This results in ethical and regulatory grey zones which can lead to studies involving AI not being assessed by an ethics committee.

To address these issues, it was recommended that RECs should include AI experts. These experts could help in reviewing research proposals involving the use of AI and serve as advisory bodies for policymakers. Uniform and coherent guidelines for AI in healthcare across EU member states were suggested. These guidelines should be reviewed regularly as AI technology advances rapidly. Comprehensive and mandatory training for ethics reviewers on the application of EU guidelines was also recommended [3].

To improve trust, laypeople could be involved in RECs. Moreover, RECs could be engaged in the ethics by design process of projects at the development stage, helping researchers reflect on and evaluate ethical considerations. Their role could continue throughout and beyond the research process, allowing them to respond to emerging ethical challenges.[4]. Based on these findings, irecs has developed training material to help REC members, ethics experts and students to learn about the technology basics and the ethical challenges surrounding research with the help of AI in healthcare. These materials will be partly presented in the presentation.

[1], [3], [4] Aucouturier, Etienne and Grinbaum, Alexei, D.2.2: Recommendations to address ethical challenges from research in new technologies. Horizon Europe irecs project (2023). [2] Ferretti, Agata, Ienca, Marcello, Sheehan, Mark et al. Ethics review of big data research: What should stay and what should be reformed? BMC Medical Ethics 22 (1), 51 (2021).

Enhancing Research Integrity in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: Lessons from Global Initiatives in Oncology

Khalid El Bairi

Faculty of Medical Sciences, University Mohammed VI Polytechnic, Morocco

Objective: Research integrity is a critical field for academia and scientific community. It is particularly relevant in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) where limited resources and educational opportunities can make researchers vulnerable to various ethical challenges such as predatory publishing, plagiarism, data manipulation, and so on. The aim of this oral abstract is to review our published global efforts to tackle these issues through research and training with a focus on oncology as an illustrative field.

Method: Four cross-sectional survey-based studies including educational interventions were conducted globally to investigate predatory publishing, and other issues of research integrity. Factors associated with each research concern were studies using univariable and multivariable statistics. Outcomes after delivering distance-education based interventions were also described.

Results: Our results revealed that many researchers, particularly in LMICs, are trapped by predatory journals due to pressures to publish quickly. Use of digital education based on distance-based interventions in different languages showed a notable improvement of researchers' knowledge on predatory publishing. Distance education, coupled with mentorship and social networks, emerged as a promising approach to enhance awareness on the issue. Another comprehensive training program on research integrity we established under the leadership of the African Organization for Research and Training in Cancer (AORTIC) encompassing various advanced courses, including those addressing predatory publishing, data manipulation, plagiarism, and gender inequity issues also provided practical guidance for oncologists in under-resourced settings and emphasized the importance of research integrity in oncology to limit the damages of flawed research on patients with cancer.

Conclusion: The critical need to enhance research integrity, especially in LMICs, where the risks of research misconduct are high, and resources are limited may be achieved by global low-cost training initiatives. The commitment of organizations like AORTIC sets an example for other societies in LMICs to actively engage in reducing disparities in training on sensitive research issues through education and training, ultimately contributing to equitable cancer research and mitigating ethical challenges in the field.

From the Margins to the Mainstream: Epistemic Injustice in Medical Crisis Decision-Making

Mina Lahlal[1], *Tobias Kerzenmacher*[2]

[1]*Zomba Hospital, Malawi and Klinik Ottakring, Vienna, Austria*

[2]*Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany*

This presentation explores epistemic injustice and structural exclusion in research-based decision-making during the COVID-19 pandemic, using Austria as a primary case study and drawing on comparative insights from global contexts. The analysis focuses on the marginalization of critical perspectives — including those of non-academic hospitals, women surgeons, BIPOC medical professionals, and clinicians from the Global South — from official pandemic advisory processes.

The case of Vienna's largest academic hospital, intentionally kept "COVID-free" in the early stages of the pandemic, illustrates how centralized authority structures prioritized academic hierarchies while sidelining frontline experiences. Key disciplines such as geriatrics, psychiatry, and anesthesiology were excluded from national expert boards, raising concerns about whose expertise was considered legitimate in shaping health policy.

Rather than enabling inclusive deliberation, Austria's approach privileged guideline-making power within university-affiliated institutions, largely disregarding international developments in countries such as Switzerland and the Nordic states. This fostered a form of insular policymaking that limited adaptive learning and reinforced narrow definitions of evidence.

The authors further engage with critiques from Global South colleagues who provocatively labeled COVID-19 a "white men's disease," underscoring longstanding global inequities in knowledge recognition and resource allocation. Such critiques point to a systemic devaluation of expertise from the Global South and non-dominant disciplines, with direct implications for global health ethics and research integrity.

In response, the presentation proposes a framework for democratizing institutional knowledge production: one that incorporates real-time feedback from frontline staff, fosters interdisciplinary dialogue, and establishes transparent, inclusive mechanisms for expert selection. Reconsidering epistemic authority is essential for building resilient, equitable, and ethically sound decision-making structures in times of crisis.

The language of this abstract was adapted with the assistance of a large language model (LLM); all ideas, interpretations, and conclusions are solely those of the authors.

Towards a Common Definition of Research Integrity in ENRIO: Findings from a Normative Analysis

Helene Ingierd

The National Research Ethics Committees, Norway

The concept of research integrity holds different meanings across institutions, cultures, and countries. These variations may be linguistic or well-founded but can pose challenges in international research and in collaborative efforts to promote research integrity. This is the background for a study carried out by the European Network of Research Integrity Offices (ENRIO).

This presentation focuses on the normative analysis of research integrity conducted as part of the project. We employed the method of reflective equilibrium, which aims to reach justified normative judgments—judgments are considered justified when there is acceptable coherence between principles and particular judgments. We examined definitions provided by ENRIO members in relation to principles articulated in key documents—The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (ALLEA) and The Singapore Statement on Research Integrity (WCRI)—as well as selected literature.

In analyzing the various definitions provided by ENRIO members, we found the following:

1. Considerable variation in norms and principles: Some definitions emphasize internal principles and norms, which relate to the specific rights, duties, and expectations of researchers and the aims of the profession. Many also include external moral principles that apply to all moral agents, not just researchers.

2. Differences in emphasis: Some definitions prioritize the handling of research misconduct, while others focus more on fostering a positive research environment and culture.

3. Variation in scope: There are differences in what aspects of research activity the term “research integrity” is included.

4. Individual vs. systemic focus: Definitions vary in terms of whether integrity is seen primarily as an individual attribute or as a concept that also encompasses characteristics of institutions, organizations, or the broader research system.

Based on our analysis, we propose a set of elements that a definition of research integrity should include. Overall, we recommend that ENRIO members clearly articulate the meaning of the term to avoid conflation or confusion, to effectively promote research integrity, and to provide guidance on addressing violations. More specifically, we recommend that a core definition of research integrity—when applied to individual researchers—should refer to the professional norms that constitute good research practice, and the norms that regulate relationships between researchers. A broader perspective on research integrity should also include reference to external norms concerning the relationship between researchers and individuals, groups, and society at large. This broader view expands the focus beyond the research process itself and addresses the responsibilities of other actors within the research system.

Acknowledgements: I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the ENRIO members for taking part in the survey.

In Quest of Conceptual Clarity: ENRIO Recommendations for Acceptable Practices for Authorship

Loreta Tauginienė

Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania

Authorship in collaborative and international research underscores the importance of acknowledging contributions equitably, promoting transparency, responsibility and accountability across research partnerships. Collaborative and international research introduces challenges in determining authorship, as diverse contributions and cultural norms can complicate appropriate acknowledgment of each contribution [1] [2] [3] [4]. To reach an agreement on the norms of acceptable practices for authorship, it is paramount to foster responsible collaboration.

ENRIO recognises the significance of clearly defining key terms related to research integrity. This clarity helps in fostering responsible research practices, handling of allegations of research malpractice and enhancing research integrity. To support ENRIO members and advance research integrity in Europe, ENRIO conducted the survey about key research integrity concepts in 2023–2024.

The findings of the ENRIO survey show that ENRIO members (n=18) define the term of authorship in a structured way; however, the attributes inherent to the definitions of authorship differ [5]. The attributes can be evaluated from six perspectives: agency (the entities to which acceptable practices for authorship apply), scope (the outlets to which these practices are relevant), form (the representations relevant to these practices), contribution (the type of contributions recognised within authorship practices), will (the acceptance of authorship), and values (the principles underpinning acceptable practices for authorship). Here, the triangle of perspectives—agency, will, and contribution—is critical for understanding acceptable practices for authorship. In the light of normative analysis, these perspectives are supported by a set of principles such as responsibility, accountability, respect, and honesty, which form the bedrock of acceptable practices for authorship that every author must embrace.

In this context, ENRIO has drawn recommendations for the definition of acceptable practices for authorship as a necessary precondition for adherence to common standards across disciplines, institutions, and countries.

Acknowledgements: I'd like to express my sincere gratitude to the ENRIO members for taking part in the survey. I'd also like to thank my colleagues, Helene Ingierd and Michaela Lenčéšová, for embarking on the journey of the maze of terms and definitions.

[1] Anderson, M. S., Kot, F. C., Shaw, M. A., et al. American Scientist 99(3), 204–208 (2011) [2] Bülow, W., and Helgesson, G. Research Ethics 14(1), 1–9 (2018) [3] Khalifa, A. A. Ethics, Medicine and Public Health 20, 100735 (2022) [4] Koljatic, M. Research Ethics 17(2), 127–134 (2020) [5] ENRIO's Key Research Integrity Concepts: Interpretations and Recommendations (forthcoming in 2026)

Normative Analysis of Research Integrity Concepts: What is the Difference Between Research Misconduct and Questionable Research Practices?

Michaela Lenčéšová[1], Ana Marušić[2]

[1]Institute for Contemporary History, Czech Academy of Sciences, Czech Republic

[2]University of Split, School of Medicine, Croatia

Different interpretations of key concepts related to research integrity are challenging in collaborative and international research and in efforts to promote research integrity and handle allegations of research misconduct across institutions and countries. ENRIO recognizes this issue and has established a working group (WG) aimed at mapping its members' definitions of key research-integrity related terms. Through normative analysis, the ENRIO WG on Key Definitions will provide interpretations and recommendations for these crucial concepts of research integrity.

Research Misconduct (RM) and Questionable Research Practices (QRPs) are central concepts in discussions of research integrity for decades. Key documents on research integrity, such as the ALLEA Code [1] and the Singapore Statement from the World Conference on Research Integrity (WCRI) [2], define RM and QRPs as violations of the principles of good research practice (GRP). However, a survey conducted among ENRIO members revealed that ambiguities remain regarding both definitions. Consequently, ENRIO WG on Key definitions believes that having clear definitions of both RM and QRPs is essential for enhancing collaborative and international research efforts.

To resolve ambiguities, we will first outline definitions of RM and QRPs as specified in the national documents on research integrity used by ENRIO members. Next, we will present the key components that should be included in both definitions based on our survey findings. We will highlight common elements of both concepts, such as violations of GRP, their impact on trust in science and the reputation of the research community, and their occurrence at all stages of research practices.

Furthermore, we will present the results of our normative analysis and compare the survey findings with the principles outlined in key documents on research integrity and relevant literature. One notable finding is that while the distinction between GRP and RM/QRPs is clear, the boundary between RM and QRPs is less well-defined. This observation presents an opportunity to reconceptualize RM beyond just fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism.

Finally, we will share ENRIO's recommendations for the definitions of RM and QRPs.

Acknowledgements: We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the ENRIO members for participating in the survey and to Helene Ingierd and Loreta Tauginienė for their valuable feedback on our normative analysis.

[1] ALLEA, The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity – Revised Edition 2023. Berlin (2023). DOI 10.26356/ECOC [2] The Singapore Statement on Research Integrity (WCRI, 2010).

Towards a Fair Recognition of Research Performed by Members of Consortia - Approaching Challenges Observed in Germany

Sophia May, Hjördis Czesnick

The Ombuds Committee for Research Integrity in Germany, Germany

The national Ombuds Committee for Research Integrity in Germany (OWID) provides advice and mediation in conflicts related to good research practice (GRP). It regularly offers guidance on authorship and has also assisted members of consortia in resolving authorship conflicts. Certain cases dealt with by OWID indicate that research conducted in consortia can encourage questionable authorship practices. Due to the number of researchers involved and the length of research projects, researchers' individual spheres of responsibility, expertise, intellectual contributions and scientific achievements become intertwined in a way that makes it difficult to allocate adequate credit within consortia [1]. Hosseini et al. 2024 [2] have systematically outlined the complexities of solving the challenge of recognising consortia members' scientific synergies by choosing so-called group authorships.

In this presentation, we will discuss possible solutions for the German context based on existing policies on group authorship. Due to a lack of data on research integrity breaches within consortia, we will analyse enquiries submitted to OWID and reports from members of consortia to delineate the nature of authorship conflicts in consortia, factors reinforcing questionable practices, and specific challenges researchers, whistleblowers, and research integrity advisors are confronted with in this context.

A major challenge to tackling this issue is to define the nuanced differences between the common ways of recognising contributions. Thus, we will discuss criteria of (a) authorship, (b) group authorship, (c) acknowledgment, and (d) citation of relevant publications of the consortium (e.g., on the data, equipment, software, methods used within the consortium) and their role in recognising contributions. To reflect upon the applicability of these criteria beyond the cases dealt with by OWID, we will interview several actors in the field of research integrity, from different disciplines, consortia, and funding agencies. Building on their expertise, we hope to better understand obstacles that might hinder large research teams from following the general guidelines of GRP.

To sustainably establish adequate recognition practices in the present-day realities of consortia, this presentation aims to stimulate preventive reflection on how to recognise consortia members' contributions to a manuscript in line with the rules of GRP. While the focus of the presentation will be on the German context, we would like to conclude by inviting the audience to bring in ideas on the challenges faced by transnational research consortia and how to address them.

[1] Hosseini, M., Lewis, J., Zwart, H. et al., Sci Eng Ethics 28, 25 (2022). [2] Hosseini, M., Holcombe, A. O., Kovacs, M., et al., Account Res, 1-23 (2024).

What does fairness mean for RI and RCR codes?: A scoping review using Critical Discourse Analysis

Claudia Pallise Perello[1], *Natalie Evans*[1], *Marian Crespo Lopez*[2], *Mariette van den Hoven*[1], *Krishma Labib*[2]

[1]*Amsterdam UMC, Netherlands*

[2]*Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Netherlands*

Currently, Research Integrity (RI) initiatives are predominantly shaped by countries in the Global North (GN). Given the influence of GN funders and publishers on global research practices, RI standards set in the GN are frequently also applied in the Global South (GS). While the GS is increasingly involved in RI initiatives there still exist a risk of ethical imperialism, where GN ethical standards are imposed as universal. This study examines if and how ethical imperialism manifests in regulatory RI documents by assessing their treatment of research fairness using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).

We conducted a scoping review to collect regional, national and international RI guidelines and codes of conduct. Conducting a search of grey literature and scientific literature, we included up to 78 codes that explicitly refer to responsible conduct of research or research integrity directed at researchers. Our analysis employs CDA to assess how fairness is constructed in these documents and analyse implicit and explicit power dynamics, silences, and assumptions.

Our sample includes an uneven representation of countries: RI codes come mostly from Euro-American countries, with limited representation from Africa and Latin America. Only a few documents explicitly mention issues of injustice, such as knowledge and material extractivism, epistemic injustice, and socioeconomic inequities and precariousness.

Few codes explicitly confront colonial hierarchies, but those that do tend to come from formerly colonized nations. Some documents acknowledge non-Western knowledge systems and alternative ethical frameworks, yet many still reflect hierarchies in their language, for instance, portraying indigenous and marginalized groups as passive agents and receivers of research rather than as groups capable of conducting research.

While some RI codes integrate diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) principles, their depth varies. Some documents employ “diversity” as an empty concept, while others propose concrete measures to counter discrimination and systemic inequalities.

Finally, fairness is frequently reduced to procedural mechanisms, such as fair authorship, peer review, and misconduct investigations, which, while essential, risk treating fairness as bureaucratic compliance rather than a structural transformation of research.

In general, the historical and geopolitical contexts of the countries that produce RI codes are reflected in the way fairness is framed. Some countries that have experienced imperialism and totalitarianism see science as a tool for resistance. Overall, European RI frameworks tend to emphasize fairness without justice, reinforcing procedural rather than structural visions of fairness. The CDA analysis, also allowed to focus on the language and tone of the documents, which also reveal cultural attitudes toward research integrity, with some codes expressing self-assurance and authority while others take a more reflexive and humble tone.

European and Global landscape analysis: an overview of actors with a mission in research integrity

Bert Seghers

Flemish Commission for Research Integrity, Belgium

Research integrity is safeguarded and monitored within the scientific community itself: we ourselves set and police professional standards in the research profession, and scientific institutions largely set the policies that shape the research ecosystem.

But which organizations are there at the different levels? Which ones are governmental, and what is the role and influence of governments at each level?

This poster visualises the actors that have a role regarding research integrity. The diagram orders their logos according to level (institutional, national, but mainly European and global) and group (government, funder, regulator, scientist/research performer, discipline).

This journey through Europe takes us past the European Council, the European Parliament and STOA, the European Commission and its Directorate-General for Research, ALLEA, ENRIO, ENAI, ENOHE, EARMA-ERION, EUA and three other networks of select universities, Horizon Europe, Science Europe and EMBO.

Globally, the following are depicted: World Conferences on Research Integrity (Foundation), International Science Council, UNESCO, Council of Europe, CoARA, the Embassy of Good Science, NERQ, FORRT, notable open-science initiatives, COPE, PubPeer, STM and its Integrity Hub, United2Act, Retraction Watch and its retraction database curated by Crossref.

The speaker is happy to annotate the chart upon request, explaining the role of each of the institutions depicted.

Scientific Consulting in Ukraine: Black Side

Artem Artyukhov, Nadiia Artyukhova

University of Economics in Bratislava, Slovakia

The academic standing of scientists is often evaluated by looking at their publications, how frequently they're cited, and their involvement in research projects. In Ukraine, scientists feel pressured to have "strong" profiles, which has led to two kinds of scientific consulting. One type is traditional, offering expert advice and supporting actual research. The other is more problematic, focusing on generating outputs for bureaucratic needs, often at the cost of research integrity. The second type of consulting, along with services like selling research papers or manipulating citation counts, also includes selling language certificates, journal editorial board memberships, and university ranking boosts. These cases show a trend where research quality is less important than just having a set of outputs, making simple metrics more valuable than real contributions.

The "scientific consulting" trend in Ukraine is similar to the concept of paper mills, but it's different because it offers a broader range of services that go against research integrity.

The authors suggest the term "scientific consulting mill" to describe the services that help scientists and teachers obtain formal performance indicators, and they provide a detailed classification of these "suppliers" and their activities. Based on the set of characteristics, the authors categorize the types of scientific consulting ("several colors of scientific consulting").

This research is based on a thorough analysis of "scientific consulting" company websites in Ukraine. These companies' services, marketing strategies, and self-descriptions were carefully examined. This analysis includes classifying "scientific consulting mills" and their features. The categories and features were developed by looking for service patterns, analyzing the implicit and explicit agreements between the companies and their clients, and identifying what differentiates these services from legitimate academic support.

Unfortunately, this issue hasn't been discussed much in academic papers about Ukraine, likely because these services are provided "officially" as an informational one with agreements between clients and providers. So, the authors are offering their classification of these services, hoping it will aid in combating this breach of academic integrity.

Research Ethics and Integrity for the Green Transition

Fabian Fischbach, Dirk Lanzerath

University of Bonn, Germany

The environmental crises commonly associated with the “Anthropocene” require rapid and comprehensive action across all sectors of society. While research and innovation (R&I) are important pillars for adaptation and mitigation, the environmental impacts of R&I itself cannot be ignored [1]. This applies both to the environmental impact of the research process itself and to the direction of research and the technological solutions and innovations sought. The consideration of environmental aspects in the design and conduct of research should be considered as part of a good scientific practice. For example, the revised version of the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity [2] states that the principle of respect also applies to “ecosystems” and “the environment”, while it is considered a violation of research integrity to cause “unnecessary harm” to the environment. However, there has been little effort to put this aspect of research integrity into practice, as current guidelines on research ethics and integrity, where they exist, are largely superficial and general in their treatment of environmental aspects of research and development and mostly fail to provide clear guidance [3].

There is an urgent need to develop a comprehensive framework for R&I to address environmental and climate ethics and integrity issues. Research Ethics and Integrity for the GREEN transition (RE4GREEN) is a three-year Horizon Europe-funded project whose main objective is to contribute to a European Research Area framework on ethics and integrity for R&I activities that support the transition to a sustainable economy and society. To this end, the project mapped the existing academic literature on the topic and analysed the gaps in the available resources on research ethics and integrity, including frameworks and guidelines as well as training materials and courses. The identified ethical issues and gaps will be further explored in eight Social Labs, that will bring together stakeholders and researchers from diverse backgrounds across Europe to provide practical insights and test the project’s findings through firsthand experience. In addition to its analytical contributions to the discourses on research ethics and integrity, RE4GREEN will produce recommendations for comprehensive environmental guidelines and training materials. At the time of the conference, the results of three key deliverables of the project will be available and presented, including the mapping of the scientific literature as well as existing R&I resources and key insights from the first two rounds of social labs conducted in the project.

[1] Samuel, G., and Richie, C. Journal of Medical Ethics, 49, 428–433 [2] ALLEA, The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (2023) [3] Tzouvaras, C., Seedall, C., and Tambornino, L., Zenodo (2025)

Open infrastructure and scholarly metadata for research integrity

Madhura Amdekar

Crossref, Netherlands

With an increasing volume of research being published every year, the scholarly record continues to grow both in terms of the number of outputs and their diversity. Preserving its rectitude is of paramount importance given the research integrity problems that continue to affect research publications at scale. Scholarly metadata has an important role to play in this endeavour. Complete and accurate metadata acts as "trust signals" by answering questions about scholarly works such as who funded the work, where it was published, was it corrected or retracted, and thereby provides important context against which the integrity of the work can be assessed. Therefore, metadata has a much wider role to play than the commonly perceived notion of it being only a part of publishers' and journals' production workflows for increased discoverability. Rather, when the right metadata trust signals are available, the scholarly community can use them to identify scholarly trends, including for identifying problematic publishing practices.

Open infrastructure providers, such as Crossref, enable its members to register metadata about the works that they publish. Crossref is a not-for-profit membership organization with nearly 22,000 members from 160 countries, and most members identifying themselves as research institutions. Crossref assigns DOIs and collects metadata for 30 research output types, some of which are journal articles, preprints, and datasets. The collected metadata ranges from elements such as author names, titles, publication dates, to metadata on funding, retractions and corrections, relationships between works ("e.g. is preprint of") and more. All this metadata is made openly available via Crossref's API and used by several downstream services such as OpenAlex, Dimensions, Scopus, Web of Science, and others that are used by researchers and across the wider scholarly community.

In this presentation, we'd like to introduce the audience to scholarly metadata and their role as trust signals in assessing the trustworthiness of research outputs. We will provide an overview of the open scholarly infrastructure, talk about the metadata that is made available by Crossref, and focus on elements such as author affiliations and ROR IDs, funding metadata, retractions and corrections, which should be of interest to this audience. We will discuss how open metadata can help institutions to track the impact and integrity of their outputs, including tracking where the research was published, what research was retracted, what is the source of funding for publications, etc. We will share examples of how others in the community have used the openly available metadata to identify problematic scholarly content. We hope that this will inspire the attendees to incorporate collection and deposition of metadata as a component of good research integrity practices at their institutions, and leverage the presence (or absence) of metadata as another evidence of integrity.

RM Roadmap - Creating Framework Conditions for Research Management to Strengthen the European Research Area

Janina Bau[1], *Teodora Konach*[2]

[1]*EU Projects Officer and Research Analyst, Belgium*

[2]*European Association of Research Managers and Administrators, Austria*

In a fast changing environment requiring solutions to meet today's issues, research managers play a vital role. The EU funded RM Roadmap Project works towards a recognition of research management as a profession by highlighting the added value of research managers, the current landscape of trainings available to research managers, existing gaps and the needs of research managers in terms of training, upskilling and funding.

The RM Roadmap project has significantly advanced the global research management (RM) community by fostering collaboration, professional development, and strategic planning. A key achievement was the creation of an Ambassador Network with about 150 ambassadors from 40 countries leading discussions on a national level and a thematic level, including ethics and integrity. The project delivered 13 key outputs, including a sustainability plan, policy brief, and a forthcoming final roadmap - a strategic guide for the future of RM in Europe, aimed at RMs, policymakers, institutions, and funders. Furthermore, the project conducted mapping exercise and compiled the RM Roadmap Catalogue with 335 opportunities for training, funding, networking, and mobility as well as the RM Roadmap Survey gathering responses from over 2,200 participants, offering insights into job roles, expertise, and employment conditions in RM, which helped define key professional areas and terminology.

The ENRIO Congress would offer the opportunity for a wider dissemination of the RM Roadmap project allowing participants to explore the role of research managers in the R&I system and the current landscape of research management across Europe including ethical implications as the RM Roadmap established a thematic group on ethics and integrity discussing topics including existing trainings and skills and competences.

This submission aligns with ENRIO's mission to advance research integrity by engaging a broad community of experts in a dialogue that considers ethical implications. A dedicated Q&A session will encourage further exchange of ideas, ensuring an interactive and collaborative discussion beneficial to both the project and the wider research community.

POSTER

Prioritizing interventions and reproducibility measures to improve research reproducibility: a Delphi consultation method

Dora Pejdo[1], *Ivan Buljan*[1], *Tamarinde Haven*[2], *Ana Marušić*[1]

[1]*University of Split, Croatia*

[2]*Tilburg University, Netherlands*

Background: The Horizon Europe iRISE project aims to enhance research reproducibility by identifying key priorities through expert consensus. A Delphi study was conducted with diverse stakeholders—including policymakers, funders, editors, publishers, and researchers—to assess reproducibility measures and interventions.

Methods: The study engaged 73 experts from 34 countries in Round 1 and 67 experts in Round 2. Using a 10-point Likert scale, reproducibility measures (n=14) and interventions (n=27) reached consensus if at least 70% of panellists rated them 8 or higher. Participants could provide qualitative feedback, which was analysed and presented in Round 2. A final panel will refine and confirm the final priority list.

Results: In Round 1, eight reproducibility measures and six interventions met the priority threshold. The top-ranked reproducibility measures were methodological quality (9.03), reporting quality (9.00), and code and data availability/re-use (8.66). The highest-priority interventions included data management training (8.52), data quality checks/feedback (8.33), and statistical training (8.33). No additional reproducibility measures or interventions from Round 1 reached consensus in Round 2.

Conclusions: This study highlights essential areas for improving research reproducibility and transparency through expert-driven prioritisation. The final panel will establish a definitive priority list, shaping targeted actions to address reproducibility challenges. Findings will support the scientific community in implementing effective policies and practices to enhance research integrity.

A concerted approach to definitions of research integrity and related concepts: ENRIO's contribution

Helene Ingierd[1], Loreta Tauginienė[2], Michaela Lenčéšová[3], Edwin C. Constable[4], Tom Lindemann[5], Ana Marušić[6], James Parry[7], Cathrine Gill[8]

[1]The National Research Ethics Committees, Norway

[2]Kaunas University of Technology , Lithuania

[3]Institute for Contemporary History, CAS, Czech Republic

[4]Kompetemzzentrum für wissenschaftliche Integrität Schweiz (KWIS), Switzerland

[5]Luxembourg Agency for Research Integrity (LARI), Luxembourg

[6]University of Split, School of Medicine, Croatia

[7]UK Research Integrity Office, United Kingdom

[8]The Health Research Board (HRB), Ireland

Research integrity and related concepts have different perceived and legal meanings in different institutions, cultures, and countries. Such variations can be well-founded but may pose challenges in international research and collaborative efforts to promote research integrity. Considering this, some reports have recommended that professional standards for research integrity should be harmonised across Europe (European Science Foundation, 2010; Resnik, 2009). The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (ALLEA, 2023) formulates four principles of research integrity that are relevant across the research system and in all disciplines: reliability, honesty, respect, and accountability. However, the Code does not provide a clear-cut definition of research integrity or related concepts.

The European Network of Research Integrity Offices (ENRIO) aims to promote responsible conduct of research, to assist in addressing potential breaches of good research practice, and to strengthen research integrity. To support ENRIO members and foster a concerted approach in advancing research integrity in Europe, ENRIO has established a working group for research integrity-related definitions. It aims to: (i) map key concepts in the countries represented in ENRIO, and to (ii) provide recommendations and interpretations of these concepts and definitions.

At the ENRIO-Congress, we will launch the ENRIO report Key Research Integrity Concepts: Interpretations and Recommendations. In this presentation, we put forward the main results from the survey questionnaire sent to all ENRIO members (e.g. research integrity offices, research ethics committees, contributors) (N=25). The response rate was 84 percent (n=21). ENRIO members were asked to provide an overview of 11 concepts and how these are defined in key national documents, such as legal regulations, and guidelines in member organisations and/or countries that they represent.We found that almost every ENRIO member has a document defining research integrity and associated concepts, yet the definitions vary considerably, as do their legal status. Overall, there is considerable variation in relation to the scope of norms included in the definitions.

The findings of this report constitute the first step in finding a common normative framework for research integrity, and a joint approach to research integrity in Europe.

References ALLEA (2023). The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity – Revised Edition 2023. Berlin. DOI 10.26356/ECOC European Science Foundation (2010). Fostering Research Integrity in Europe: A report by the ESF Member Organisation Forum on Research Integrity. Strasbourg. https://www.esf.org/fileadmin/user_upload/esf/ResearchIntegrity_Report2011.pdf Resnik, D. B. (2009). International Standards for Research Integrity: An Idea Whose Time has Come? Accountability in Research, 16(4), 218–228. https://doi.org/10.1080/08989620903065350

Research Integrity Country Report: Belgium

Bert Seghers[1], Inge Lerouge[2], Marianne De Voecht[3], Stephanie Ruysschaert[4], Stefanie Van der Burght[5], Leyla Soslambekova[6], Martyna Bajorinaite[6], Danielle Balériaux[7]

[1]Flemish Commission for Research Integrity, Belgium

[2]KU Leuven, Belgium

[3]University of Antwerp, Belgium

[4]UHasselt, Belgium

[5]Ghent University, Belgium

[6]Legal & Ethics office, VUB, Belgium

[7]Conseil Supérieur pour l'Intégrité Scientifique, Belgium

At the 2015 Rio de Janeiro World Conference on Research Integrity, it was suggested to follow up on the development of national systems with respect to research integrity, through the use of "country reports" or "country cards", to be presented at subsequent World Conferences [1, 2]. This presentation contributes to that effort by mapping the research integrity landscape in Belgium, a federal state with a strong research focus.

After setting the scene with some key figures about the research intensity in Belgium, we will outline the country's research integrity governance. Although governmental competence for research policy lies mainly with the Flemish and the French-speaking community, both parts of the country have very similar structures and policies. Research integrity is safeguarded by a reporting-based system: institutional commissions for research integrity, embedded in the institutions, investigate reported allegations. An overarching community-level body can give a second advice (comparable to Finland and the Netherlands). Given the scale of both communities, it is also possible to exchange best practice.

We highlight some unique features of the system, such as the Flemish modular online training course on research integrity "Mind the GAP (Good Academic Practice)" and the use of the ALLEA code (instead of a national code) as the primordial framework in assessing alleged violations of research integrity, as well as some persisting and new challenges we face as research integrity professionals and which we consider to go broader than the Belgian context.

This information will be gathered based on both institutional policies and the professional experience and practitioner's perspective of the authors involved. The authors coordinate the Commissions for Research Integrity at the five universities in Flanders (Dutch-speaking Belgium), or represent the second-advice bodies in both parts of the country.

[1] Kleinert S., Marusic A., Focus track on improving research systems: the role of countries, Proceedings of the 4th World Conference on Research Integrity. Res Integr Peer Rev 1 (Suppl 1), 9 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-016-0012-9 [2] Perković Paloš, A., Roje, R., Tomić, V., & Marušić, A. Creating research ethics and integrity country report cards: Case study from Europe. Accountability in Research, 31(6), 620–654. (2023) https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2022.2163632

Fostering a Culture of Research Integrity: The Role of the Scientific Integrity Counsellor at the Joint Research Centre

Tilemahos Efthimiadis

Joint Reserach Centre, European Commission, Netherlands

Maintaining scientific integrity is crucial for upholding the trustworthiness and credibility of research. This poster presents the function of a Scientific Integrity Counsellor, a confidential ombudsperson role established within the European Commission's Joint Research Centre (JRC) as part of the JRC Framework for Scientific Integrity and Research Ethics (SIRE). The Counsellor provides confidential consultations, advisory services, and mediation to staff members, ensuring anonymity and impartiality. By linking with institutional bodies such as the Research Ethics Board and Scientific Committee, the Counsellor plays a pivotal role in promoting a culture of excellence, transparency, and accountability.

The Scientific Integrity Counsellor is a unique role that serves as a trusted advisor and guide for staff members navigating complex issues related to research misconduct, data manipulation, conflicts of interest, and ethical dilemmas. As a part-time function carried out in parallel to regular duties, the Counsellor brings a deep understanding of the research environment and the challenges faced by reserachers. The Counsellor's work is closely tied to the JRC's commitment to excellence and transparency in research, and adherence to the highest standards of scientific integrity.

This poster aims to showcase the importance of the Scientific Integrity Counsellor role in fostering a culture of scientific integrity, and to facilitate networking and exchange of best practices among attendees. We invite researchers, integrity officers, and ethics experts to share their experiences and insights on promoting scientific integrity within their own institutions, and to discuss the challenges and opportunities of establishing similar roles. By sharing knowledge and expertise, we aim to foster a discussion that promotes scientific integrity, ethics, and responsible conduct in research, and to support the development of robust and effective systems for upholding the highest standards of scientific integrity.

Direct and surrogate benefit in cancer clinical trials

Marcin Waligora

Jagiellonian University Medical College, Poland

Clinical trials in oncology assess the safety, efficacy, and adverse effects of novel cancer therapies. The high toxicity of the tested substances renders clinical trials in oncology particularly challenging. To fulfill adequate risk/benefit ratio requirements for these trials, many regulatory and methodological solutions were adapted. For example, unlike in other types of clinical trials, in phase 1 cancer trials, participants are not healthy volunteers but patients with cancer who have exhausted standard treatment.

Exposing participants of cancer trials to highly toxic agents must be weighed by the importance of the trials' objective, a promise of high benefit for participants and significant social value of these trials. In the presentation, I will evaluate the nature and ways of measurement of benefit in clinical trials in oncology. I start from an analysis of clinical endpoints used in these trials and test if they may be defined as the direct benefit. Subsequently, I evaluate therapeutic dose in trials as an indicator of direct benefit for participants. I will also reflect on alternative benefits for the trials' participants. Finally, I highlight the challenges associated with harvesting data about benefit from clinical trials.

Funded by the National Science Center, Poland, UMO-2021/41/B/HS1/01123.

POSTER

Challenges to ethics review of emerging technologies

Antonija Mijatovic, Ana Marušić

University of Split School of Medicine, Croatia

Background: The aim of the study was to provide a broad overview of the challenges faced by research ethics review bodies concerning new technologies, stakeholders, collaborations, and frameworks, in response to evolving research environment. The study was conducted as part of the Horizon Europe project Challenges and innovative changes in research reviews (CHANGER).

Methods: We used scoping review methodology. A literature search was performed using major bibliographic databases – Scopus, Web of Science, and PubMed – as well as grey literature sources. The SyRF (Systematic Review Facility) platform was used for screening, and a Large Language Model (LLM) was employed for data extraction. We implemented a methodology that included three iterations of GPT-4 text analysis: 1) piloting phase with refinement of the LLM prompts and output validation; 2) a topics extraction phase where we identified ethical and legal issues, technologies, new forms of collaborations, and frameworks/guidelines mentioned in the articles; and 3) categorization of extracted data and binary coding to allow comparative analysis across all documents. The collected evidence base was used to create Evidence and Gap Map (EGM) – systematic and visual presentation of the availability of evidence for the identified challenges to ethics review. The map was created in Python (version 3.8.19).

Results: In total, 756 academic articles, 65 deliverables from 46 Horizon 2020 projects and 13 deliverables from 8 Horizon Europe were included in this scoping review. We identified most common ethical challenges across various scientific fields. Key issues include informed consent (mentioned as a primary focus in 119 articles), privacy (196 articles), data sharing (32 articles), security (64 articles), and transparency (47 articles), which are tightly related to technological advancements. The EGM offered a visualization of these challenges, indicating areas where ethical concerns were most prevalent. For example, AI faces risks related to bias and privacy, while biomedical engineering and genomics highlight the need for legal and regulatory frameworks, and for ensuring informed consent. Similarly, robotics and automation show concerns around safety, security, and regulatory gaps. Big data analytics presents challenges in data privacy and security, while digital health involves risks on privacy, transparency, and public trust.

Conclusion: Our findings highlight the need for interdisciplinary and adaptable ethics review mechanisms that can address emerging ethical challenges. The EGM provides a visual guide for ethics review improvements and regulatory development in evolving research environments.

European Network of Ombuds in Higher Education

Markus Seethaler, Anna-Katharina Rothwangl

Austrian Student Ombuds Office, Austria

The European Network of Ombuds in Higher Education (ENOHE) is an independent, non-profit organization that serves as a platform for connecting professionals who work as ombuds in higher education, as well as supporters of their work. With a growing membership from institutions across the globe, ENOHE aims to promote the role of ombuds in higher education, foster professional standards, and encourage best practices. Its objectives include advocating for the ombuds concept within academia, supporting activities related to the role and function of ombuds, sharing knowledge on best practices, collaborating with other organizations, and more.

ENOHE hosts an annual conference in Europe to advance its mission while also offering regular webinars, newsletters, and guidance to help its members implement policies and professional standards. A recent milestone for ENOHE was the adoption of its “Values and Principles” document, which outlines the core values guiding the work of ombuds professionals in higher education.

Research integrity is a recurring theme in the work of higher education ombuds, as they often deal with cases related to scientific misconduct, whistleblowing, and the rights of defendants. Ombuds in higher education serve both students and faculty, navigating complex issues such as power imbalances, strained interpersonal relationships, and instances of discrimination. When it comes to research integrity, collaboration between ombuds offices and research integrity offices can be particularly beneficial, especially in intricate cases. However, approaches differ across countries. In some contexts, research integrity offices focus solely on academic staff, excluding students. This segmentation highlights the critical importance of fostering cooperation between ombuds and research integrity offices to bridge institutional gaps.

ENOHE has already established an informal cooperation agreement with the European Network of Research Integrity Offices (ENRIO) in Bratislava 2016, which lays the groundwork for further collaboration. This poster aims to introduce ENOHE’s mission and activities to attendees at ENRIO congress in Ljubljana, with the goal of exploring additional opportunities for partnership and collaboration in advancing research integrity within the higher education landscape.
References: Information about ENOHE can be found on their website at: https://www.enohe.net/

Resources for RI and RE Education

Lene Os Johannessen, Johanne Svanes Oskarsen, Ingrid Synnøve Torp

National Research Ethics Committees (NREC), Norway

The National Research Ethics Committees (NREC) in Norway aims at ensuring that all research is conducted in accordance with recognized research integrity (RI) and research ethics (RE) norms. A main societal goal for NREC is to ensure that researchers and research institutions promote ethically sound and responsible research. To reach this goal we do preventive work, counseling, publish general and specific decisions and investigate individual cases concerning possible misconduct.

A part of NREC's preventive work is to make resources that may be used in RI and RE training and teaching.

Building on knowledge of what is considered most essential internally, and what is most frequently used by our digital visitors, we have developed a resource for teaching RI and RE. For selected topics, this presents academic articles, guidelines, discussion examples and, when relevant, legislation. The goal is to support research institutions, lecturers and researchers in RI and RE training.

RI and RE norms are dynamic and developed over time, synchronous with societal changes. We believe that continuous discussions are needed to promote reflection on integrity and ethics in research. Examples of selected topics are "Introduction to RI and RE", "Misconduct in research", "Co-authorship", and "Responsibility towards society and nature".

Therefore, the teaching resource is:

1) based on RI and RE norms and standards in the research community: to be responsible and recognized by lecturers and researchers.

2) specified towards some selected topics: to cope with the particularity of RI and RE issues.

3) identifying relevant factors that researchers should consider and reflect upon: to foster discussions, reflections and assessments of RI and RE.

4) case driven: exemplifying how to activate the guidelines in real life situation.

5) living: the resource includes a feedback form and is developed by the secretariat, so that it can be easily updated.

How can principles of research integrity be used to promote an open and constructive debate in the aftermath of research projects gone wrong?

Anna Holmesland, Maria Sandhaug Sandhaug, Camilla Bø Iversen

The National Research Ethics Committees, Norway

Can principles of research integrity be used as a tool to ensure safe, open, fair and honest discissions within research communities when a research project has gone wrong? We would like to present a poster, inviting participants of the ENRIO 2025 Congress to debate and exchange experiences.

We will link our discussion to a Norwegian research project on colon cancer. The project was approved by a regional research ethics committee in Norway, in accordance with the Norwegian Health Research Act and the Declaration of Helsinki, but terminated prematurely due to severe irregularities. The police fined the responsible institutions, and the Norwegian Board of Health Supervision demanded research data to be deleted and not published. Regional ethics committees argued that deleting research data, and hindering publications of negative scientific results, was unethical towards the participants, and not beneficial to society in general.

When the authorities have been involved in handling cases like the above example, what room is left for the research communities to discuss ethical dilemmas associated with the sanctions imposed? Furthermore, if accusations are made against individual researchers who might have acted in good faith, or administrative reactions are imposed against a research group or a research institution, consequences may be that an open and constructive assessment of past events is in fact hindered. In worst case researchers might avoid entering into new projects. This might hinder publications of new scientific knowledge.

By presenting our thoughts and questions at the ENRIO 2025 Congress, we encourage other participants to share experiences they might have with similar cases. We aim for a joint reflection on how principles of research integrity may be used to promote fruitful discussions after irregularities in research projects have been uncovered. The goal must be to prevent similar situations in the future.

Using country reports to visualise the diversity in European national research integrity landscapes

Ana Marušić[1], *Bert Seghers*[2], *Kalle Videnoja*[3]

[1]*University of Split School of Medicine, Croatia*

[2]*Flemish Commission for Research Integrity, Belgium*

[3]*European Network of Research Integrity Offices, Finland*

National systems for safeguarding research integrity differ a lot across Europe. To capture and show this diversity, research integrity pioneers suggested the development of "country reports" or "country cards" in 2015 [0]. This presentation consists of 3 parts:

(1) We show the history and (parallel) development of the "country report" concept by presentations on the World Conference [0], ENRIO [1], the Embassy of Good Science [2] and the research community (funded by Horizon projects or separate from them).

(2) We will demonstrate the use of country reports by showing coloured maps of Europe, detailing for each country which possible roles of national bodies are covered, in terms of (i) case handling (investigation/mediation); (ii) developing or publishing important RI documents (code of conduct, analyses and insight reports, policy recommendations, and case reports); (iii) RI training and education; and (iv) organizing the research (integrity) community.

(3) We will explore future directions for developing and using country reports, and their potential for soft harmonization across Europe and beyond. In particular, we present two possible follow-up actions which could benefit the European research integrity community: (i) for every European country, a short summary with links and an overview of institutional contact points for candidate-reporters and editorial offices of journals; and (ii) An inspiration guide for establishing a national body for research integrity — the zoo of national systems as an annotated menu of choice.

Acknowledgements: Thanks to Nicole Föger (then ÖAWI & ENRIO) and Sabine Kleinert (The Lancet) for introducing, together with co-author Ana Marušić, the concept of country reports at the 2015 World Conference on Research Integrity [0]. Thanks to Grace van Arkel for feedback on this proposal and prior work on this topic, notably assembling the first version of [1].

[0] Kleinert S., Marusic A., Focus track on improving research systems: the role of countries, Proceedings of the 4th World Conference on Research Integrity. Res Integr Peer Rev 1 (Suppl 1), 9 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-016-0012-9 [1] ENRIO Country Reports, https://www.enrio.eu/country-reports/ [2] The Embassy of Good Science Country Report Cards, https://embassy.science/wiki/Special:BrowseData/Report

Academic Integrity in Latvian Higher Education Institutions: Insights of Survey Findings

Laila Silamiķele, Matīss Reinfelds, Anna Stikāne, Rasma Pīpiķe, Raimonda Soloha

Latvian Association of Young Researchers, Latvia

At the national level, there is no publicly available, representative data on academic integrity and questionable research practices in Latvian higher education institutions (HEIs). To address this gap, in 2023 the Latvian Association of Young Researchers conducted a study to gain a predominantly qualitative insight into the culture of academic integrity in Latvian HEIs and to assess understanding, common practices, and attitudes towards academic ethics.

Responses were collected from 110 HEI employees and 14 HEI ethics committee representatives from all Latvian HEIs providing doctoral-level studies, using anonymous online surveys. The survey covered topics such as the role of academic integrity in institutional values, employee awareness and training, risks leading to integrity violations, trust in institutional mechanisms for addressing issues, and experiences with academic integrity problems. In addition, ethics committee representatives were asked to provide statistics on cases of academic misconduct.

The main results of the study highlight incoherent perception of academic integrity subject matters and a disconnect between HEI ethics committee representatives and HEI employees. Nearly one-third (31%, n=34) of HEI employees reported first-hand or second-hand experience with academic integrity violations. An additional 22% (n=24) were uncertain whether a particular violation could be considered serious. Key identified risks include pressure to publish, administrative burden, and insufficient institutional support, pointing to areas in need of improvement. The results also indicate a lack of trust in institutional governance, such as ethics committees, reporting procedures, and enforcement policies. Notable discrepancies exist between ethics committee representatives and HEI employees: 79% (n=11) of ethics committee representatives expressed confidence in their institution's ability to recognize and appropriately address academic integrity violations, compared to 33% (n=36) of HEI employees.

To foster a unified culture of academic integrity, Latvian HEIs should focus on transparent processes, effective communication of institutional policies, and regular, targeted training for academic, scientific, administrative staff, and students. Strengthening institutional mechanisms, such as establishing an independent national-level research integrity office, could help build trust and ensure an objective review of violations. Addressing broader structural issues is crucial to creating a sustainable academic environment where ethical conduct is prioritized over short-term productivity metrics.

Ombuds Committee for Research Integrity in Germany as an Integrative Institution for Safeguarding Research Integrity

Martin Steinberger[1], *Hjördis Czesnick*[2]

[1]*German Research Foundation (DFG), Germany*

[2]*Ombuds Committee for Research Integrity, Germany*

The Ombuds Committee for Research Integrity in Germany advises researchers and research institutions on good research practice (GRP) and in cases of conflict. It also is involved in national and international networking activities and in actively shaping the discourse on GRP. In 2025, the Committee, which was installed in 1999, started to work under the umbrella of a supporting association which unites all major German science organizations. This development, which can be seen as a success story to strengthen research integrity in Germany, was accompanied by a comprehensive structural reorganization of the Committee and its office.

Our poster will present the structural and legal foundations of the upheaval of this national research integrity body as well as its interdependencies with other players in Germany, Europe and beyond. The predecessor organisation, the so-called “German Research Ombudsman” was set up back in 1999, following the memorandum ‘Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice’ published by the German Research Foundation (DFG). However, it did not have its own legal form and was financed through project funding. In 2015, the German Council of Science and Humanities published ‘Recommendations on Research Integrity’ and advocated the establishment of a cross-institutional platform at national level that should act as forum for exchange and standardisation. This platform should also make recommendations for quality assurance at universities and scientific institutions.

The idea arose, that the “Research Ombudsman” could take over these tasks, but before that, it needed a stronger legal foundation. The idea took off and in 2021, strategic deliberations were stepped up, aiming at legal independence as a registered association and financial institutionalisation. To achieve this challenging task, the DFG contacted diverse stakeholders, underlining the importance of maintaining GRP as a permanent task. In 2022, the German Bundestag (the parliament) agreed that the DFG could institutionally support the intended association. Simultaneously, the members of the Alliance of Science Organisations – a collaboration of the major German research funding and research performing organisations – agreed to become the founding members of this supporting association. Eventually in 2024, the association ‘Ombuds Committee for Research Integrity in Germany e.V.’ (OWID) was officially registered. OWID e.V. now acts as a supporting organisation, all over strengthening the Ombuds Committee’s work.

We present this pathway to building a legal body to promote research integrity, which required extensive political and strategic collaboration between different stakeholders and advocate a joint approach at the national level.

Mapping the variety of national research integrity actors in European countries: a country-report-sourced annotated map

Bert Seghers[1], *Kalle Videnoja*[2]

[1]*Flemish Commission for Research Integrity, Belgium*

[2]*European Network of Research Integrity Offices, Finland*

National bodies with a mission on research integrity connect through ENRIO. Across Europe, however, these national organisations are very diverse: almost every national landscape is unique.

This diversity is complex and not easily visualised, but this poster aims to map it. The map of Europe highlights the national-level organisations in research integrity with their respective roles. Icons indicate whether organisations:

(i) Handles allegations at the national level, and how (initial investigation, second opinion or through mediation);

(ii) Provides training either directly for researchers, for research integrity professionals, or by curating or developing training materials;

(iii) Publishes documents related to research integrity, in particular a code of conduct or national guidelines, information reports or analyses, policy documents or recommendations, and/or case reports (be it summaries or full judgements, anonymised or not);

(iv) Fosters the professional community by organising or supporting networks of researchers or research integrity professionals;

(v) Is affiliated with ENRIO, either as a member organization or in another way.

The authors are happy to provide further clarification on request, including details about the role of each institution depicted with their logo. Moreover, we hope to complete the map in dialogue with participants at the conference.

Naming and defining scientific integrity: a challenge. The case of French in an international context

Bernard Harmegnies, Danielle Baleriaux

Conseil Supérieur d'Intégrité Scientifique, Belgium

In recent decades, the scientific lexicon has been enriched with a new "word" : scientific integrity. Initially limited in its use to the NIH bodies, where it had appeared in 1989 ("Office of Scientific Integrity" creation), in order to deal with certain misbehaviors found in researchers. The word had not been defined otherwise than indirectly, by the type of problems that OSI would have to deal with (falsifications of results, fabrications of data, plagiarism…). Given the moral resonances, of the problems treated, the name has gained popularity outside the scientific world.

Gradually, the research communities and policy-makers became aware of misbehaviors of scientists in other disciplines than those in charge of the NIH and also in other countries. Various instances of scientific integrity thus appeared in countries other than the United States, confirming the universality of the phenomena to be treated. The name being born in an English-speaking country and being used in a scientific context (whose main language of use is also English), these new structures have therefore simply been associated with the original lexical unit "scientific integrity", or translation layers of the latter (i.e. «intégrité scientifique» in French or «Wetenschappelijke Integriteit» in Dutch, etc.).

During this time, however, regardless of the language, no one seemed to realize that the concept associated with these lexical units had hardly been the subject of definitory reflections. However, as noted by Anderson et al. [1], In most contexts where scientific integrity appeared, structures already existed in charge of related concerns (ethics committees, deontological commissions, etc.), all having, in various capacities, also to deal with the acceptability of specific research practices.

As a matter of fact, there was a soft consensus about the non-equivalence between the quasi-synonymic terms, but it would be necessary, one day or another, to succeed in differentiating positively the denominations. Corvol [2] is one of the first, in a francophone context, to have outlined an interesting contrastive approach, unfortunately remained too little developed in the reference literature.

Today, many thinkers of scientific integrity argue for a certain distancing from its initially repressive dynamics and ipso facto call for the emergence of a constructive dynamics of scientific integrity, encouraging the growing development of scientific integrity training initiatives. Now, therefore, it is important to be able to answer precisely and convincingly the question of every novice: "what is scientific integrity?". We intend to investigate the modus operandi to be developed for this purpose, placing ourselves in the context of "Francophonie", a geopolitical space with a transnational, official body, the OIF, which brings together 93 states (323 million citizens) having in common the use of French, including emerging countries that have or will have to deal urgently with issues of scientific integrity.

Lessons Learned: The Importance of Early Integrity Risk Identification in Research

Grace van Arkel[1], Ibo Van de Poel[2]

[1]Integrity Office TU Delft, Netherlands

[2]Integrity Board TU Delft, Netherlands

This workshop focuses on lessons learned from a Dutch research integrity case which gained (inter)national attention and on one lesson in particular: the importance of early risk identification in light of power dynamics to prevent possible violations of research integrity. By means of introduction, presenters (i) in short explain the Dutch national research integrity structure and code, and (ii) give a summary of the Dutch case and overview of lessons learned from the Dutch case (which resulted in Recommendations and an Action Plan and implementation hereof within the Institution).

The focus in the workshop will be on the action addressed to the research institute's director and deans of the faculties holding the duty of care of risk identification in an early stage of the research and offering possibilities to have these risks and risk-increasing factors (partly influenced by power dynamics) openly discussed within the research institute and faculties. An interactive part follows and starts with discussing a research integrity dilemma dealing with risks in research (to be found in the EUR Dilemma Game App) followed by a discussion of the different answers to this dilemma. After the discussion, presenters return to the Dutch case, sharing the results they gained from discussions with the Institution's Executive Board, Deans and Director on general and specific risk-increasing factors within the different faculties resp. the research institute. Next, attendees are asked – based on formats which will be handed over – to answer the following questions for their own institutions

(1) what general and specific risk-increasing factors are they faced with and are presenters' examples recognizable or do attendees' institutions deal with other risks?

(2) is there room for discussing risk-increasing factors in their institutions?

(3) if not, does internal or external power dynamics have an impact on an open discussion? and

(4) which ways are there (or can attendees think of) in mitigating (possible) risk-increasing factors?

The objectives are (1) to give insight in the Netherlands research integrity structure including its binding code of conduct for research integrity, holding an institutional duty of care to have dilemmas on research integrity openly discussed with researchers, and (2) to share experiences with others in and outside Europe on general and specific risk-increasing factors in research which may lead to possible violations of research integrity. Conclusion: in this workshop lessons learned from a Dutch research integrity case are shared, hereby stressing the importance of early integrity risk identification in research in order to prevent possible violations of research integrity standards. With the workshop presenters hope to get insight into the question whether and how researchers in other institutions in and outside Europe deal with general and specific integrity risks in research leading to possible violations of research integrity.

The Future is Now: AI, Academic Ethics and the Science Communication

Reda Cimmperman, Rima Sinickė, Kristina Puzarienė

Office of the Ombudsperson for Academic Ethics and Procedures, Lithuania

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is no longer something we're waiting for – it's already here, changing how we teach, learn, and communicate science. In university classrooms, students are using AI tools to write, summarize, brainstorm and create visuals. These technologies can support learning and creativity, they also raise difficult questions: What does academic ethics look like when AI is involved? How can we fairly assess student work? And how do we prepare students to use these tools responsibly? What does responsible authorship look like when AI is involved? How do we evaluate originality and critical thinking? And how do we teach future communicators to use AI tools ethically and transparently?

This workshop brings together students, academic staff and experts in ethics and science communication for an open and important conversation. We will begin with a brief introduction and reflections on the key challenges we are facing. Then, in the World Café format, participants will move into small group discussions focused on three key questions:

1. Where is AI taking us? What changes are we seeing in teaching and science communication and how can we adapt?
2. How can we keep assessment fair? In an academic environment where AI tools are widely accessible, how do we understand original work?
3. What should we be teaching students about AI? What skills, values and ethical understanding do students need to use AI responsibly?

After the group discussions, we'll come back together to share ideas, questions and good practices. If you are already using AI in your teaching or just starting to think about it, this is a space to learn from each other, compare experiences and explore practical solutions.

The workshop is hosted by the Office of the Ombudsperson for Academic Ethics and Procedures of the Republic of Lithuania, which works to support fairness, responsibility and trust in academic life. In 2024, the Office became a national and regional hub in the EU-funded COALESCE project, joining a European network of institutions working to strengthen science communication through collaboration, training, and community building. This session is part of our broader commitment to helping universities respond to new ethical challenges in a fast-changing world. If you care about academic integrity, responsible teaching or the future of science communication – we warmly invite you to join us.

The BEYOND BAD APPLES Project's Resource Guides on Addressing Misconduct and Promoting Research Integrity

Rosemarie de La Cruz Bernabe[1], Kadri Simm[2], Tonje Lossius Husum[3], Alina Coman[3], Valerie Gaudin[4], Eero Kaila[5], Vivian Mbanya[1], Ian Slesinger[6], Signe Mežinska[7]

[1]University of Oslo, Norway

[2]Institute of Philosophy and Semiotics, University of Tartu, Estonia

[3]Oslo Metropolitan University, Norway

[4]French Research Institute for Agriculture, Food and the Environment, France

[5]Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK, Finland

[6]Trilateral Research Ltd, United Kingdom

[7]University of Latvia, Latvia

Workshop (90 min) The Horizon EU Project BEYOND BAD APPLES is a multinational collaboration exploring how both individual and institutional responsibilities relate to research misconduct (RM), research ethics (RE), and research integrity (RI). As we progress towards our final goals, including the publication of the BEYOND Guidelines and Best Practices Manual and the 2030 Roadmap—a set of guidance documents that will hopefully usher in a systematic change in focus from 'bad apples'—a type of understanding of research misconduct as a problem stemming from the unethical actions of individual researchers—towards a more holistic approach that includes and emphasizes structural factors.

In this workshop, we seek to share our insights and invite valuable input from attendees to refine and enhance our efforts.

1. Welcome and introduction (5 minutes) – Introduction by project lead Rosemarie de la Cruz Bernabe – Workshop's objectives and format.
2. Presentations from the working groups (25 minutes) – Short presentations from project's groups, working on the documents: • BEYOND Guidelines: the scope of these guidelines is to address RM and promote RI. These guidelines are intended to supplement existing standard operating procedures in RE. They will facilitate the adoption of gained knowledge for various key stakeholders, including researchers and research publishing organizations. • Best Practice Manual: This case-based, context-sensitive, and practice-oriented best practice manual includes effective measures to promote RE/RI and address RM. This manual is intended for students, researchers (junior and senior), citizen scientists, research publishing organizations, research funding organizations, and regulators. • 2030 Roadmap: The BEYOND 2030 Roadmap sets a 5-year medium to long-term agenda for improving institutional research culture around research ethics and integrity. Based on results from the BEYOND project it outlines solutions to improve institutional research culture in terms of RE/RI based on areas of need identified through the project research.
3. Open forum for feedback and questions (15 minutes) – Attendees share thoughts, ask questions, and are informed of necessary topics and concepts relevant to the next exercise.
4. Small-group work sessions (30 minutes) – Small-group discussions facilitated by project members, covering the following topics: • Group work on the Guidelines (multiple small groups on different chapters, if possible) • Group work on Best Practice Manual • Groupwork on Roadmap

5. Summaries from small groups (10 min) – The groups get back together, and share their insights, recommendations and criticisms.
6. Closing remarks and next steps (5 min) – Summary of key insights from the workshop. Invitation to stay connected with the BEYOND project and updates on upcoming milestones.

Unlocking Synergies: The IP-OS Best Practice Manual and Capacity Building Programme in 27 countries

Julia Priess-Buchheit, Marie Alavi

Kiel University, Germany

Integrating Intellectual Property (IP) management with Open Science (OS) practices is crucial in the ever-evolving research and innovation landscape. This workshop introduces the "best practice manual called Synergy Framework," a pivotal component of the IP4OS HorizonEurope project, designed to enhance the valorisation of knowledge through an aligned IP-OS approach. This workshop will delve into the core of the best practice manual, which offers strategic guidance for harmonising IP management with the openness ethos of science, adhering to the motto "as open as possible, as closed as necessary." The manual – developed on evidence from the European community – presents workshop participants with accessible good practice examples and tools to align Os with fitting IP.

Our workshop will illuminate best practices, providing insights for the participants to foster knowledge and skills to bolster IP management in an OS-friendly manner. After short presentations, we will start with a single learning unit on AI, IP and OS to show the participants (beginners to professionals) what it means to deepen their knowledge. Further, we will invite participants to invite institutions from their countries into the capacity-building programme of IP4OS to enrich their institution's capabilities, encompassing the Synergy Core Curriculum and establishing teams to support their researchers in IP decisions.

The workshop will engage the participants through dialogical activities such as fishbowl and small team challenges, with the collaborative efforts of the diverse IP4OS team—including thought leaders in IP, OS, technology transfer, and science communication. We ensure that the complex topic stays with the audience's real-world challenges and experiences and gives a good entry point to the Best Practice Manual and training resources. Attendees will gain insights into effectively applying IP-OS principles within their respective fields, ultimately contributing to enhancing RESPONSIBLE and TRUSTWORTHY research valorisation within the European Research Area. If you like, we can provide you with a detailed workshop agenda.

Authorship and research integrity issues: Workshopping solutions to a chronic problem

Anni Sairio[1], Petra Falin[1], Eero Kaila[1], Kalle Videnoja[2], Oona Myllyntaus[1]

[1]Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK, Finland

[2]European Network of Research Integrity Offices, Finland

Authorship issues are common in research misconduct allegations and investigations in the queries that for example Finland's research integrity advisors receive, despite various institutional and national guidelines and training resources available. Factors such as quantitative metrics in research assessment and research funding, discipline-specific practices in multidisciplinary projects, and power imbalances play a role in authorship problems, and the necessary preventive discussions in projects may be difficult to navigate. Training also tends to be targeted at early-career researchers, but PIs and senior researchers have more decision-making power.

This workshop aims to bring together RI practitioners, researchers, trainers and educators, and other experts to discuss the current landscape in authorship issues, the preventive measures that organisations and projects can adopt, and how to implement guidance and best practices efficiently. The premise of the workshop is in preventive work, and the participants are asked to read Cooke et al (2021) before the workshop.

In this workshop, we will:

- Chart current and emerging issues that should be considered in authorship guidance and training
- Discuss best preventive practices and efficient implementation of guidance
- Equip participants with take-home messages through mutual learning and knowledge-sharing and with a summary of key insights

After the event, the organisers provide the participants with a document of the key insights of the workshop.

Please register by 11 September 2025! If you have registered and are not able to attend, please notify the organisers.

References: S.J. Cooke, N. Young, M.R. Donaldson, E.A. Nyboer, D.G. Roche, C.L. Madliger, R.J. Lennox, J.M. Chapman, Z. Faulkes, and J.R. Bennett. 2021. Ten strategies for avoiding and overcoming authorship conflicts in academic publishing. FACETS. 6: 1753-1770. https://doi.org/10.1139/facets-2021-0103

A primer to using open scholarly metadata for research integrity

Evans Atoni[1], *Madhura Amdekar*[2]

[1]*Crossref, Kenya*

[2]*Crossref, Netherlands*

This workshop is for researchers, research integrity officers, members of research funding organisations, and others, to introduce them to scholarly metadata and the tools and techniques they can use to retrieve metadata for assessing the integrity of research outputs. The scholarly record consists of research outputs such as journal articles, book chapters, datasets, software, preprints, and more. Metadata about each of these outputs also forms a part of the scholarly record and conveys important information about these items. Crossref is a community-governed, not-for-profit membership organisation that enables its members to register metadata and persistent identifiers (DOIs) for the work that they publish. Made up of over 165 million research outputs from over 21,000 members, the metadata registered with Crossref is a rich and open source of data for researchers and several downstream services. In addition to basic metadata such as titles, publication dates, names of authors, journal titles, members also deposit metadata on funding information, post-publication updates (retractions and corrections), relationships between research outputs (e.g. “is review of”, “is preprint of”) and more. This data is made openly available via Crossref’s APIs and therefore can be a valuable resource for assessing the integrity of published work – providing context for individual outputs, as well as for conducting research on research at scale.

In this session, we will introduce the participants to the metadata that is deposited by the scholarly community with Crossref, and how this can act as trust signals about scholarly works. We will provide an overview of the metadata elements that are of most relevance in the context of research integrity, such as affiliation metadata, funding metadata, retraction metadata (including retractions and corrections from the Retraction Watch database which has been acquired by Crossref and integrated into our REST API), and how they are connected to each other. We will demonstrate how to construct topical API queries to retrieve this metadata to answer questions such as: Which works have been funded by specific funders? Which of these funded works have been retracted? Which works have been retracted? How to find works associated with your institution? How to find works published by a specific research organisation that have been retracted?

During the remainder of the session, the participants will have the opportunity to try their hands at building API queries to retrieve metadata of their interest and ask any questions. We hope that with information from this session, not only will the participants learn how to use open metadata to track the outputs of their research institutions, but they will also be able to see the value of metadata as a tool available to them for assessing the integrity of work produced by the scholarly community.

Case-based approach for new and emerging issues in research ethics and integrity training

Kadri Simm, Mari-Liisa Parder, Heldi Marleen Lang, Emmi Jennina Kaaya

University of Tartu, Estonia

Popular case-based approaches to research ethics and integrity (REI) are promising also in addressing new and emerging topics, such as topics related to AI use, ethical issues related to citizen science and the rehabilitation of researchers. Starting from the 1980 in business ethics, case-based approaches, which have been found to be effective [1], are now applied also in REI trainings (e.g. Rotterdam dilemma game, Virtue training materials). Current material focuses on values discussion via games [2] and is adapted to REI training. The material is designed to develop competences needed for dialogic communication, including: 1) skills for listening and responding, 2) openness, 3) empathy, and 4) mutuality orientation [3] [4]. What differentiates this material from other similar material is the fact that the provided solutions to the cases are informed by four ethical theories: deontology, utilitarianism, care ethics and virtue ethics. The aim of the material is not to teach a single “right” answer to the dilemma, but to highlight the potential conflicts between two or more valuable ethical principles to carry out moral reasoning. The material includes a group-based activity designed to foster ethical competencies. It combines individual tasks – such as taking first personal responsibility by choosing one’s own solution with collaborative work, including discussing the case, proposed solutions, their underlying motivations and values, and potentially reaching a consensus. The material also presents dilemmas in their broader environmental and situational context.

Enhancing Research Ethics Training in the Age of AI: Insights from a European Multi-Institutional Needs Assessment

Vasileios Stamatopoulos[1], Dimitris Kyriazanos[2], Effrosyni Mitsaina[1], Xenia Douka[2], Ana Marušić[3]

[1]INNOFY/Fraud Line PC, Greece

[2]National Centre For Scientific Research ˝Demokritos˝, Greece

[3]University of Split, School of Medicine, Croatia

The rapid growth of artificial intelligence (AI) in scientific research introduces new ethical challenges that existing governance structures are often unprepared to address. The BriGRETE project—Bridging the Gap: Research Ethics Training and Education —aims to strengthen research ethics education and institutional support mechanisms across Europe. This abstract presents the results of a comprehensive needs assessment carried out with Research Ethics Committees (RECs) and researchers in seven European countries, focusing on current ethics practices, knowledge gaps, and training priorities, particularly in relation to emerging areas such as AI. Using a mixed-methods approach, we collected qualitative data from 17 REC interviews and quantitative responses from 449 researchers. REC members identified common barriers such as high workload, insufficient resources, and the absence of tools to manage proposal reviews effectively. Most committees still rely on unsecured communication systems like email, and many lack the expertise to assess AI-driven research proposals confidently. These constraints hinder communication with researchers and reduce the overall efficiency and transparency of ethics oversight.

There was a strong call for digital case-management tools and training on emerging ethical domains— particularly AI, data protection, and bioethics linked to advances in biomedical technologies and health research. Researchers similarly expressed concern about gaps in training and institutional support. While the majority recognised the importance of ethics in research, nearly one-third cited time constraints, lack of clear guidance, ethical grey areas, and insufficient access to training as major barriers. Notably, 43% of researchers identified the ethical implications of AI and machine learning as their most pressing training need—followed by topics like data protection and publication/authorship ethics. Both groups showed strong interest in additional training and more specifically in blended training formats that combine online courses with interactive workshops and emphasised the need for standardised and compulsory ethics curricula. These findings have direct implications for ethics education policy and practice.

We outline how the BriGRETE project is responding by designing a modular curriculum tailored to researchers' and RECs' needs, including dedicated AI ethics modules, case-based learning materials, and digital case management tools to streamline ethics review. Our results also align with European frameworks such as the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity and the EU AI Act, highlighting the urgency of preparing the research community for forthcoming regulatory requirements. Ultimately, the study underscores an urgent need for enhanced research ethics education that is both comprehensive and adaptable. By improving the availability, relevance, and delivery of ethics training—especially in relation to emerging scientific areas and technologies such as AI —the BriGRETE project seeks to promote a culture of ethical research and empower both researchers and ethics reviewers to navigate complex ethical landscapes with confidence.

Ethics at the Edge: Reimagining Integrity in Research Funding, Institutional Partnerships, and Academic Freedom

Mina Lahlal[1], Tobias Kerzenmacher[2]

[1]Zomba Hospital, Malawi and Klinik Ottakring, Vienna, Austria

[2]Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany

This workshop addresses the growing ethical and structural tensions surrounding how universities — particularly medical institutions — engage with research funding, institutional partnerships, and academic freedom. Central to the discussion is a recent case at the Medical University of Vienna, which accepted funding from a major firearms manufacturer — a company whose weapons are now present in active conflict zones, including the Russia-Ukraine war. While many leading institutions have implemented restrictions on funding from the tobacco and alcohol industries, few have developed consistent frameworks for evaluating other ethically problematic partnerships, such as those involving arms producers or extractive industries.

This workshop asks: What principles should guide institutional decisions about funding sources, and what role should ethics committees and research integrity officers play in upholding these principles? The session also explores how decisions about funding intersect with academic freedom. Increasingly, researchers face not only constraints on the topics they may pursue, but also limitations on the criticisms they may express regarding their institutions' own practices. Ethics committees — originally intended to protect human subjects and vulnerable communities — are at times repurposed as tools of institutional control, stifling critical discourse and reinforcing status quo agendas.

Participants will engage with the following questions:

- How can universities develop transparent, participatory, and independent processes to assess and govern funding relationships?
- How should ethics committees balance the protection of research participants with safeguarding researchers' rights to pursue politically sensitive or critical inquiries?
- How do internal institutional hierarchies shape whose concerns are legitimized — or dismissed — in funding decisions, research agenda-setting, and ethical deliberation?

The workshop will engage participants in small group discussions using a case-based ethical matrix, complemented by international examples and institutional case studies. Discussion topics will include the strategic expansion of university partnerships into oil-rich regions, contrasted with the lack of coordinated institutional support for underserved communities — highlighting the disconnect between universities' stated missions of "health and well-being" and their actual funding practices. Through structured exercises and collective analysis, the workshop invites participants to reimagine a university culture that is not only research-active, but also ethically consistent, transparent, and socially accountable. The language of this abstract was adapted with the assistance of a large language model (LLM); all ideas, interpretations, and conclusions are solely those of the authors.

High-level priority setting towards an agenda of actions and interventions to foster research integrity

ENRIO and Science Europe welcome participants of the ENRIO Congress to a high-level priority setting workshop, aimed at developing a joint, cross-sector understanding of priorities to foster research integrity in Europe.

The workshop will bring together a variety of stakeholders to prioritise collective actions in support of research integrity and good research practice. It builds on recent discussions and activities of the co-hosting organisations and aims to bridge the specific roles and responsibilities of different stakeholder groups, promoting collaboration and coordinated action in support of research integrity and good research practice. The workshop will explore and prioritise, through breakout sessions, a number of possible action domains, including:

- Safe culture for reporting misconduct
- Systemically learning from investigated cases / open case reports
- Avoiding serial frauds travelling internationally
- Overcoming the barriers in changing research assessment and culture
- Joint action against AI-powered research criminality (e.g. paper mills)
- Strengthened platforms and formats for international sharing and networking

Participants will be invited to reflect on these areas, and others, prior to the workshop. The event will conclude with an effort to establish a consensus on key actions to take forward and means to further promote collaboration towards these. A collaborative publication following the event will summarise key outcomes and provide recommendations for collective action.

How do European funded projects promote research integrity policy and practice in the European Research Area...

As Europe navigates rapid technological advancements and political and societal change, the continent is faced with the challenge of improving global competitiveness in research and innovation, whilst simultaneously upholding European values of openness, equity, and sustainability. Central to meeting this challenge is the embedding of research integrity and research ethics in European, national, and institutional research policies and practices.

This satellite event will outline how the European Commission's vision for the responsible conduct of research in the European Research Area (ERA) is translated into the science for policy processes and funding streams for collaborative European projects, with an introduction to the priorities for the 2026-27 work programme.

This will be followed by a series of sessions from current European initiatives which all aim to strengthen research integrity and research ethics within the European Research Area.

Representatives from the Embassy of Good Science platform and six key European projects (IANUS, POIESIS, VERITY, RE4GREEN, PREPARED and CHANGER) and two collaborating national projects (LYTE and LUKE) will lead sessions on four cross-cutting research integrity challenges:

1. Building supportive frameworks for fostering trust in science;
2. Fostering open, equitable and inclusive research and innovation ecosystem;
3. Embedding sustainability principles in research to support the green transition;
4. Developing research system resilience for times of disruption and change.

These interactive, mixed format sessions will give the audience the opportunity to familiarize themselves and exchange knowledge about the complexities of challenges Europe faces, as well as the insights, policy recommendations and associated tools and training materials developed by the European projects.

The event will end with a presentation of the Embassy of Good Science platform and a demonstration of how the platform fosters wider engagement with projects' outputs, creates connections between projects and existing resources, and encourages the long-term use and impact of project results.

Try-outs of research integrity trainings (powered by NERQ)

This satellite event addresses the critical need for a community of practice among research integrity (RI) trainers in Europe. Despite the global prevalence of responsible conduct of research (RCR) trainings, there's a significant lack of consensus on effective methods, curricula, and content. In addition, trainers may have diverse disciplinary backgrounds, experience, and personal goals. This rich diversity across Europe is not harvested, and many RCR/RI trainers build their training from scratch, reinventing the wheel. The Network for Education and Research Quality (NERQ) aims to bridge this gap by fostering structured peer learning. This half-day event will serve as a practical platform for RI trainers to share and receive constructive feedback on their work.

The program includes:

(i) An introduction to NERQ and its peer coaching initiative, including a group for "desk coaching" on training materials;

(ii) The presentation of a draft rubric designed for assessing RI trainings;

(iii) The delivery of "try-out" sessions where trainers will be able to put in practice their training and engage their peers, followed by a feedback session;

(iv) A collective discussion on the future of this peer coaching initiative, exploring opportunities for regular sessions and the elaboration of the rubric.

This interactive event offers a unique opportunity for RI trainers to refine their skills, share best practices, and contribute to a more cohesive and effective approach to research integrity education in Europe.

2nd Global Satellite Research Integrity Networking Meeting

The European Network for Research Integrity Offices (ENRIO), in collaboration with the Netherlands Research Integrity Network (NRIN), warmly invites all research integrity practitioners (e.g. coordinators, representatives, members of Research Integrity networks/offices/ departments, researchers, policy advisors) who wish to learn and exchange practices with those actively engaged in promoting research integrity at both national and transnational levels, to attend the 2nd Global Satellite Research Integrity Networking Meeting, which will take place on 22nd September 2025 (13:15 – 15:15; hybrid mode).

This informal event aims to foster dialogue and networking among participants, and facilitate peer learning through the exchange of experiences, primarily highlighting effective practices and obstacles faced by participants in their efforts to raise awareness of research integrity. Your participation is essential to identify good practices and challenges encountered in promoting research integrity at local, national, or transnational levels.

Feel free to contact us (info@nrin.nl) if you would like to attend this event, and please let us know whether you will be attending onsite or online.

We look forward to meeting you in Ljubljana or online soon!

Bert Seghers (ENRIO) & Rita F. Alves dos Santos (NRIN)

Advancing Research Integrity in Slovenia: Developments–Challenges–Perspectives

This round table will examine the evolving institutional landscape of research integrity in Slovenia. It will open with an introduction to the recently established National Council for Ethics and Integrity in Science and its Rules of Procedure for Handling Allegations of Research Misconduct. A broader discussion will follow, addressing the role and effectiveness of research integrity committees, challenges in handling misconduct cases, and ways to foster a culture of integrity across universities and research organizations. Prospects for national coordination and international collaboration will be discussed, including the advisory role of the National Council.

The round table will be held in Slovenian.

Confirmed speakers:

- Dr. Rok Benčin, ZRC SAZU, National Council for Ethics and Integrity in Science
- Prof. Nataša Novak Tušar, National Institute of Chemistry
- Dist. Prof. Dušica Pahor, MD, University of Maribor
- Dr. Nina Peršak, University of Ljubljana

ISBN 978-961-297-723-8