

Code of Ethics for Researchers

Third edition

This Code of Ethics for Researchers was developed by the Science Ethics Commission (Commission for Research Integrity) and adopted by the General Assembly of the Polish Academy of Sciences on 25 June 2020.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PREFACE	3
2. UNIVERSAL ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND VALUES IN RESEARCH WORK.....	4
3. GOOD PRACTICES IN RESEARCH.....	5
3.1. Research data.....	6
3.2. Research procedures	7
3.3. Authorship and publication	8
3.4. Reviews and opinions.....	10
3.5. Educating young researchers and students	10
3.6. Relations with the public	11
3.7. Disclosure of conflicts of interest.....	11
4. VIOLATIONS OF RESEARCH INTEGRITY	12
4.1. Gross misconduct	12
4.2. Reviews and citations violating research integrity.....	13
4.3. Other types of misconduct.....	13
4.4. General principles for handling identified violations of research integrity.....	14
5. ATTACHMENTS	15
Attachment 1. Guidelines for handling cases of violations of research integrity.....	15
1. Procedures for reporting allegations	15
2. Explanatory proceedings.....	16
3. Disciplinary proceedings	17
4. Opinions of the Science Ethics Commission (Commission for Research Integrity)....	18
Attachment 2. Practices related to international collaborative projects	19

1. PREFACE

1. This Code of Ethics for Researchers is based on the fundamental principles of ethics that have been developed within our cultural realm and are recognized as natural and universally applicable.

2. The fundamental principles of ethics refer to respect for human dignity and life in all its manifestations, truthfulness, honesty, integrity, the obligation to observe commitments taken on, and the recognition of the right to freedom of belief and the right of ownership. Standing guard over each given individual in ethical matters is their own conscience and sense of responsibility for the quality and integrity of research and education, whereas the evaluation of facts and external acts that infringe upon the interests of others is subject to the judgment of credible bodies.

3. Ethical values, the standards of research integrity, and good practices in research highlight the ethical and social responsibility of researchers. Researchers must be aware of their special responsibility towards society, humanity at large, and the natural environment.

4. This Code of Ethics for Researchers presents the principles established by the research community in the belief that the primary duty of researchers is to observe the established principles and to maintain honesty, truthfulness, and impartiality during research work. The Code defines the criteria of good practices, identifies ethical violations in the conduct of research work, and establishes procedures to be followed in the event dishonest research behavior is revealed.

Changes in external and internal circumstances – such as the significant popularization of higher education, the growing number of researchers, the need to apply for grants to conduct research, the parametric evaluation of researchers and research institutions, and conflicts of interest associated with the commercialization of research results – coupled with the limited funding available for science, encourage special attention to be paid to the intensification of ethical violations in recent years.

5. Maintaining high standards in research and assessing scientific achievements in a fair manner are fundamentally important not only for the internal coherence of science, but also for its

credibility and authority in society. In order to maintain public trust, members of the research community should show concern for their authority and refuse to yield to pressure.

2. UNIVERSAL ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND VALUES IN RESEARCH WORK

The fundamental and universal ethical principles and values upon which the integrity and reliability of science are based apply to representatives of all scientific disciplines, with no exception. Observance of these principles and values should be required of all researchers, of the institutions in which they carry out their research, and of those who fund research, publish its results, and organize scientific life, both in their relations with one another and in their contact with the outside world.

These universal principles include:

- 1) conscientiousness in portraying the objectives and intentions of planned or ongoing research, outlining research methods and procedures, interpreting the results, and communicating information about possible threats and well-substantiated predictions regarding benefits and possible applications;
- 2) reliability in conducting research, a critical approach towards the results, meticulousness, attention to detail, and care in the presentation of research findings;
- 3) objectivity: interpretations and conclusions must be based exclusively on facts, verifiable reasoning, and data that can be confirmed by others;
- 4) independence from external influences over the conduct of research, with respect to both those who commission studies or expert opinions, and to political, ideological, religious, or economic pressure groups;
- 5) openness in discussing one's own research with other researchers, which is one of the key conditions for advances in science and contributes to the accumulation of knowledge through the publication of research results, as well as in communicating this knowledge honestly to the public;

- 6) transparency in documenting research, ensuring data availability after the research results are published;
- 7) responsibility towards the subjects of research; studies involving human or animal subjects can only be carried out when this is necessary and with respect for human dignity and animal rights, on the basis of approval issued by the relevant ethics committees, including bioethics committees;
- 8) researchers' responsibility for the socioeconomic and environmental consequences of the conclusions being formulated;
- 9) fairness and integrity in evaluating the merits and ethical aspects of the work of other researchers and in reviewing and recognizing the scientific achievements of those to whom such recognition is truly due, by properly citing sources and honestly recognizing their contributions to scientific achievements;
- 10) refraining from invoking one's scientific authority when speaking out on topics outside one's own area of expertise;
- 11) the courage to oppose views contrary to scientific knowledge and practices incompatible with the principles of research integrity;
- 12) concern for future generations of researchers, manifested not only in respect for co-workers, their fair treatment, and support for their scientific development, but also in the communication of binding standards and ethical norms.

3. GOOD PRACTICES IN RESEARCH

The term "good practice in research" embraces detailed and rationally substantiated rules of proper conduct that are possible to introduce in individual research units, related to the conduct, presentation, and review of research, and intended to ensure the fulfillment of ethical requirements. All researchers from the beginning of their activity should be aware of these rules and know the consequences of violating them.

The responsibility for promoting and applying good practices rests on the scientific community as a whole, which includes the researchers, research institutions, as well as governmental and non-governmental agencies operating in the field of science.

The principles of good practice should be observed in the following areas:

- 1) research data management;
- 2) research procedures;
- 3) authorship and the publication of research results;
- 4) reviews and opinions;
- 5) educating young researchers and students;
- 6) relations with the public;
- 7) managing conflicts of interest.

Practices may be assessed depending on cultural differences; definitions, traditions, legal regulations, and institutional provisions may vary significantly depending on the scientific discipline. Therefore, each research unit should, if necessary, revise these practices to comply with legal requirements or traditions, thus creating its own set of good practices, and require its staff to apply them. Observance of ethical principles in research practice is fostered by the formulation of opinions on projects by relevant research ethics committees. The development of a code of good practices or the establishment of such committees also apply to research sponsors and scientific publishers, which should observe the principles of publication ethics, for example, by following the Code of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). A lack of such internal rules of conduct reduces the credibility of the institution.

Higher-education institutions and research institutes should provide training on the principles of ethics in research (including the recommendations of *The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity* (2017) and by the League of European Research Universities, 2020).

3.1. RESEARCH DATA

All original source data, that is, the primary results of research on which publications have been or will be based, and in some cases samples or materials from ongoing research, should be

carefully documented and securely archived in a manner that prevents data manipulation and ensures that once the research is published, the data will remain available for a duration that is relevant for the given discipline.

The tangible objects and research data acquired as part of the activities of a research institution are owned and administered by that institution or by the external institution funding the research subject to intellectual property laws and contractual provisions. Those involved in the acquisition of these objects or data should have the priority right to their scientific use. Detailed matters related to these rights and obligations should be included in the statutes and rules of institutions.

3.2. RESEARCH PROCEDURES

1. All research in natural and engineering sciences should be preceded by an analysis of the associated risks and the impact that the research results may have on society and the environment.
2. In all research, goals should be formulated that are possible to achieve according to the criteria adopted in a specific discipline. In the process of applying for research funding, realistic research goals should be formulated, and in the course of research, every effort should be made to achieve them with care for integrity in the presentation of results.
3. In research involving human subjects, human dignity should be preserved and human autonomy should be respected by ensuring voluntary participation in the research, which means consent to participation in such research.
4. The objects of study, such as all forms of living organisms, the natural environment, and cultural goods, should be treated with respect and care.
5. The health, safety, and welfare of both co-workers and individuals not directly involved in the research being conducted must not be threatened.
6. Researchers are obliged to manage research funds in a balanced way and to account for them in a reliable manner.

7. Those commissioning or sponsoring research should be made aware of the ethical and legal obligations that bind researchers and the possible limitations that result from this fact.
8. In special cases justified by other provisions, researchers should maintain the confidentiality of research data or results, if such requirements are made by those who commission research or employers.
9. A researcher is obliged to notify the employer if the results of research indicate the possibility of events posing a threat to the health or life of humans or animals, as well as the environment.

3.3. AUTHORSHIP AND PUBLICATION

1. Researchers should publish the results of their research, and their interpretations should be reliable, transparent, and accurate and research methodology should be described in a manner that allows it to be replicated by other researchers.
2. The authorship of a scientific publication must be based on the fulfillment of at least one of the following conditions: a creative and significant contribution to the research, which means a significant contribution to creating scientific ideas, formulating concepts, and designing research, an unquestionable active involvement in the acquisition of data, in the analysis and interpretation of the findings, as well as a substantive and reliable contribution to preparing and critically drafting the article from the point of view of the applicable scientific criteria.
3. Obtaining funding, providing access to equipment and related training, collecting data, or exercising general administrative supervision of a research group do not give anyone the right to claim co-authorship. The head of a research unit may not be listed automatically as a co-author of articles published by his or her subordinates.
4. All authors are fully responsible for the content of the publication unless otherwise specified (for example, that they are responsible only for a specific portion of the research in their area of expertise). When the affiliations of authors are listed, it is recommended that the nature of their contribution be specified.

5. A co-authored publication intended as a basis for the application for an academic degree or title should contain a separate, self-authored section or be edited in such a manner as to allow the evaluation of the precisely identified contribution of each co-author to the publication.
6. Names of the authors of a publication should be listed in the order that is customary in a given scientific discipline and should be accepted by all co-authors at the initial stage of drafting the publication. Intellectual contributions of other individuals who have a significant impact on the published research should be appropriately acknowledged.
7. Financial support and other types of assistance should be appropriately acknowledged.
8. Republication of the same work (or significant portions thereof) may be accepted only with the permission of the editors, and it should always include a reference to the first publication. Such studies that are related to one another in significant portions and in significant scope should be included in the list of the author's achievements as a single item. Artificially inflating the list of publications by multiple mentions of the same scientific achievement under different titles is a reprehensible practice.
9. References to publications of other authors must always follow the rules of proper citation. Authors should avoid unjustified self-citations or citations of works substantially different from the content of their publication with the intention to increase the citation rate or other scientific indicators for themselves or for others.
10. Contact with the general public and the media is subject to the same standards of honesty and precision as the publication of the results of work. Exaggerating the importance of research results and their practical applicability is a reprehensible practice.
11. Science is universal, but it is also a component of national cultures. Researchers should therefore strive to popularize the scientific achievements of their home countries; in doing so, however, they should be guided primarily by the merits of such achievements and the need to maintain proper proportions in this regard.

3.4. REVIEWS AND OPINIONS

1. Reviewers may not undertake tasks related to the evaluation of research works, scientific achievements, and research concepts of other researchers when this falls outside the scope of their own scholarly experience and competence.
2. Reviewers involved in the evaluation of research projects, publications, scientific achievements, applications for positions in research institutions or other forms of recognition may not be involved in the evaluation process in any case where there is a conflict of interest between them and the person being evaluated that calls into question the objectivity of the evaluation.
3. Reviews should be meticulous, accurate, and objective, and evaluations should be well-founded. Unfounded positive reviews are equally reprehensible as unfounded negative reviews.
4. Neither reviewers nor editors of scientific publications may make use of the data or concepts contained in the texts provided to them without the author's consent. This also applies to reviewers of applications for funding of research projects.

3.5. EDUCATING YOUNG RESEARCHERS AND STUDENTS

1. Entrusting supervisors with supervision of bachelor's, master's or doctoral students should be a matter of particular concern for the relevant bodies of the research unit authorized to conduct relevant types of studies. These bodies should assess whether the supervisor's qualifications are sufficient for the management of a specific type of work and whether the number of individuals under the supervisor's supervision does not exceed the possibility of reliable supervision.
2. The supervisor of a person conducting research should perform duties in a reliable manner, in particular by making every effort to ensure that the research being conducted meets all the requirements for research and the dissertation being written does not contain any borrowings from the works of other authors. Supervisors are likewise co-responsible for

any copyright violations or violations of good practice in research on the part of their doctoral students.

3. The supervisor of any person conducting research should ensure that this person is made aware of the ethical principles applicable to research and article writing and should act as a role model for this person.
4. Students should be treated by academic teachers not only as learners but also as partners.

3.6. RELATIONS WITH THE PUBLIC

1. Public statements should be characterized by concern for the credibility of science. They are governed by the same standards of honesty and accuracy as the publication of the results of work.

2. Researchers, as citizens who must not remain indifferent to public affairs, should speak out publicly, especially on matters that concern the general public and fall within their area of expertise. This pertains above all to the social sciences and in particular to problems related to the proper functioning of political and legal institutions.

3. The final stage of the research process involves publishing results in scientific journals, books, and textbooks. From the moment of the publication of the results of one's own work, their content becomes public property, an element of general scientific knowledge available to everyone. This means that the outcomes of scientific work constitute both the personal achievements and property of the author, and a common and general public good.

3.7. DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Conflicts of interest may occur when researchers engage in additional activities outside of their primary place of work. This may occur when:

- 1) there are links between the evaluator and the person or research unit being evaluated;
- 2) there are links between a member of the body granting funding and the person or research unit to which these funds are granted;

- 3) devices, materials, or services necessary to conduct research are purchased from businesses that are linked financially, in terms of ownership, or in terms of management to an individual conducting the research or a person close to such an individual;
- 4) the work of students, doctoral students, and co-workers, as well as the equipment of the unit, is used for additional work for the benefit of a business that is linked financially, in terms of ownership, or in terms of management to an individual conducting research or a person close to such an individual;
- 5) an employee of a research institution is involved in the work of a business or holds shares in a business that operates in the same area as the institution where that employee works and uses the equipment and know-how of the institution.
- 6) researchers should file annual statements on any conflicts of interest to their employers, and if such a situation arises, they should follow the guidelines they receive to make the necessary changes.

4. VIOLATIONS OF RESEARCH INTEGRITY

4.1. GROSS MISCONDUCT

The most serious types of misconduct, especially those that harm the ethics of research, include fabrication and falsification of research results, which constitute a gross violation of the fundamental principles of doing science, as well as plagiarism.

1. **Fabrication** of results means making them up and presenting them as if they were real.
2. **Falsification** means changing or omitting inconvenient data, which prevents research results from reflecting the truth.
3. **Plagiarism** involves using other people's ideas and research results or content without giving credit to the source, which constitutes a violation of intellectual property rights.

Such types of misconduct may occur both at the stage of the submission of a research project proposal and application for funding, during the conducting and reviewing of research, and in

the presentation of its results at conferences or in publications, the citation of the results of research done by other researchers, the compilation of expert opinions, and in science popularization. Such misconduct may contribute to the disqualification of the person committing it as a researcher. Uncovering such misconduct must therefore always lead to the initiation of disciplinary proceedings.

4.2. REVIEWS AND CITATIONS VIOLATING RESEARCH INTEGRITY

Highly reprehensible types of misconduct also include violations of research integrity in reviewing doctoral dissertations, dissertations serving as the basis for awarding the degree of *doktor habilitowany (associate professor)*, applications for the title of a professor, and all applications for employment in research institutions, as well as reviews of research projects. Avoiding giving an opinion or refusing to give an opinion without objective reasons, when the person giving the opinion believes that such an opinion should be negative, is likewise reprehensible.

Unjustified self-citations and unjustified citations of other people's works as well as deliberate omission of citations are likewise reprehensible and unbecoming of a researcher.

4.3. OTHER TYPES OF MISCONDUCT

In addition to gross misconduct, there are many other types of misconduct in research. An exhaustive list would not be feasible here. However, the following types of misconduct should be mentioned:

- using the contribution of other individuals, students, doctoral students, and co-workers in conducting research without their consent and without acknowledging such contributions in the publication or listing them as co-authors;
- granting co-authorship to individuals who failed to make sufficient intellectual contributions to the publication;
- allowing the conduct of research that has nothing in common with the reliable study process.

All forms of harassment and discrimination against students and co-workers in the form of an autocratic style of team leadership, and generating an uncollegial atmosphere by encouraging co-workers to engage in unfair research competition, are reprehensible. Such types of misconduct also include being guided by non-merit-based considerations, especially nepotism in the employment of new staff and in the allocation of research funds.

4.4. GENERAL PRINCIPLES FOR HANDLING IDENTIFIED VIOLATIONS OF RESEARCH INTEGRITY

The main responsibility for handling identified misconduct rests with the employers who employ researchers, namely higher-education institutions, research institutes, as well as public and non-public research centers.

Ethical violations committed by students should be corrected without undue delay and they should be reprimanded by their research supervisors.

All allegations of research misconduct must be properly examined and, if these allegations are confirmed, the facts and circumstances surrounding them should be investigated in detail to take relevant corrective and disciplinary steps in accordance with applicable laws. Care should also be taken to ensure that those involved in the investigation include individuals with relevant experience in the field of science to which the identified misconduct relates.

Reactions to behavior incompatible with ethics in research should depend on the gravity of the misconduct, the nature of its intent, its consequences, and other aggravating or mitigating circumstances.

Improper handling of identified misconduct, such as a failure to report misconduct, attempts to cover up the matter, retaliation against whistleblowers, and violation of relevant procedures, should be classified as a gross violation of the fundamental principles of research ethics.

Researchers are likewise obliged to respond to improper behavior on the part of government authorities towards researchers and the results of their research.

5. ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1. Guidelines for handling cases of violations of research integrity

1. Procedures for reporting allegations

A person who detects research misconduct or has reasonable suspicion that an act inconsistent with research ethics has been committed is obliged to report the problem to the head of the unit where the research is conducted (the rector in the case of a higher-education institution, the director of an institute in the case of research institutes, or the head of a unit in the case of other research units) or to the relevant disciplinary officer, and if there is a conflict of interest at the management level – to the head of the superior institution (such as the supervisory authority). The report should include the specification of the allegation, its detailed substantiation, a signature, and contact details. The identity of such a person reporting research misconduct (called a whistleblower) is not to be disclosed until disciplinary proceedings are initiated.

If the person reporting the misconduct decides that this would be more appropriate, the allegation may be reported to the chair of the Science Ethics Commission (Commission for Research Integrity), who may ask the person reporting the misconduct to provide additional explanations. If the chair of the Science Ethics Commission (Commission for Research Integrity) determines that, in light of the circumstances described in the report, the allegation is substantiated, it is forwarded to the head of the unit where the person who allegedly committed the misconduct is employed in order to initiate proceedings.

In special cases, the Science Ethics Commission (Commission for Research Integrity) may, on its own initiative, refer cases concerning violations of the principles of research ethics by employees of universities, research institutes, and research units of the Polish Academy of Sciences to the relevant bodies of those units with the recommendation to conduct explanatory proceedings. Information about the results of such explanatory proceedings should be forwarded to the Commission without undue delay.

2. Explanatory proceedings

Explanatory proceedings, whose purpose is to determine whether the initiation of disciplinary proceedings is substantiated, are conducted by the disciplinary officer. If the information provided to the disciplinary officer concerns a gross violation of the principles of research ethics (section 4.1. of this Code), the disciplinary officer is obligated to initiate explanatory proceedings *ex officio*. In other cases, explanatory proceedings are initiated at the request of the body appointing the disciplinary officer, which means the rector of the higher-education institution or the scientific council of a research institute or an institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences, or when the disciplinary officer concludes that this is appropriate.

Ensuring relevant conditions for the disciplinary officer to act is extremely important. The explanatory proceedings should be particularly thorough, detailed, and carried through in accordance with the procedures applicable in a given institution, with respect for the right of defense of the person accused of misconduct, and with accuracy and objectivity. Participants in the explanatory proceedings should reveal all circumstances, including those that may give rise to a conflict of interest. Documentation related to all aspects of the explanatory proceedings should be detailed. The person against whom an allegation has been made should be notified of the initiation of the explanatory proceedings without undue delay. Such a person should be given an opportunity to submit explanations and should have the right to legal counsel.

In order to maintain the highest standards in these cases, it is extremely important that the explanatory proceedings must be kept strictly confidential, the group of people informed about the explanatory proceedings must be limited, and the documentation must be properly secured to protect those involved in the explanatory proceedings, on the condition that this is not detrimental to the explanatory proceedings or the health and safety or welfare of the participants in the explanatory proceedings. Necessary information can only be disclosed to third parties on the condition that these third parties are obliged to maintain confidentiality, unless they are already obliged to do so by virtue of their function. The explanatory proceedings should end with a confidential report containing the findings and recommendations for further action. A copy of such a report is given to the person reporting the misconduct and the person accused of the misconduct.

If the head of the unit determines, based on the report, that the allegation of research misconduct was unfounded despite being made in good faith, the explanatory proceedings will be terminated, and the parties will be notified of this fact. The person accused of misconduct should have the right to demand that the dismissal of the allegations be made public. However, if the head of the unit determines that the allegations were not made in good faith, the head of the unit will take specific disciplinary action against the person who made the allegations.

If the explanatory proceedings were carried out by a competent disciplinary committee on the basis of a report submitted on its own initiative by the Science Ethics Commission (Commission for Research Integrity), the results of these explanatory proceedings should be forwarded without undue delay to the Commission [in accordance with Article 39(2) of the Act on the Polish Academy of Sciences of 30 April 2010 (*Journal of Laws* of 2019, item 1183 as amended)].

A reviewer who determines that the author of a text being reviewed has violated copyright is obliged to report this fact to the publisher and the head of the unit employing the author of the manuscript. If the review concerns a publication providing the basis for application for a scientific degree or title, the reviewer will report this to the Council for Scientific Excellence.

3. Disciplinary proceedings

The purpose of disciplinary proceedings is to establish whether an alleged act was committed and to issue a decision whose wording will depend on the findings. These proceedings are carried out, depending on the employee's place of employment, pursuant to the provisions of the Act on the Polish Academy of Sciences of 30 April 2010, the Act of 20 July 2018 – the Law on Higher Education and Science (*Journal of Laws* of 2020, item 85, as amended), and the Act on Research Institutes of 30 April 2010 (*Journal of Laws* of 2019, item 1350, as amended). These provisions regulate in detail the manner in which such proceedings are carried out, the content of the decisions made in the proceedings, the catalog of disciplinary penalties, the procedure for appealing against the decisions of the disciplinary commission of the first instance, the possibility of resuming the proceedings, and the measures for appealing against disciplinary decisions in court.

Care should be taken to ensure that during the examination of a specific case the adjudicating panels within disciplinary commissions do not include individuals who have close links to the person accused of misconduct or with the person reporting the misconduct and individuals who are at risk of another conflict of interest. The initiation of disciplinary proceedings is communicated without undue delay with particular confidentiality by the head of the institution to the heads of the agencies funding the project under which the proceedings have been initiated. In the granting of public funds for research, final and non-appealable decisions of disciplinary commissions in cases related to violations of research ethics are taken into consideration. Failure to report the result of disciplinary proceedings to the heads of the agencies granting funds for research, the concealment of such proceedings, as well as ignoring signals of irregularities in a given research unit along with failure to take appropriate explanatory and disciplinary steps will prevent the unit from obtaining public funds for research until appropriate corrective action is implemented.

4. Opinions of the Science Ethics Commission (Commission for Research Integrity)

All the provisions stipulated above provide for the possibility for disciplinary commissions to request that the Science Ethics Commission (Commission for Research Integrity) issue an opinion in the event of doubts as to the classification of the misconduct. In light of the special legal significance of such an opinion, which is then binding for the disciplinary commission in determining the content of the violation of the principles of research ethics, the disciplinary commission should explain its doubts in detail in its request. The request for an opinion addressed to the Science Ethics Commission (Commission for Research Integrity) should be accompanied by the necessary case file.

Similar actions are taken in the case of proceedings for the awarding of academic degrees or an academic title, and in the case of final and non-appealable decisions by disciplinary commissions in cases involving violations of law by a candidate, including copyright or the principles of good conduct in science, the Council for Scientific Excellence or the Presidential Chancellery are notified.

Attachment 2. Practices related to international collaborative projects

Before starting research in international projects, it is important to determine which country has jurisdiction to investigate an allegation of a violation of the principles of ethics or research integrity and how that investigation should be organized, as well as how to respond to situations in which significant elements of national policies are incompatible in this regard. In such cases, it is recommended that reliance be placed on the recommendations proposed by the coordinating committee of the OECD Global Science Forum and its proposed boilerplate for an International Agreement.

Boilerplate text for a Research Integrity Agreement in International Research Projects proposed by the coordinating committee of the OECD Global Science Forum.

We, the parties, agree:

to conduct our research according to the standards of research integrity, as defined in the ‘Guidance Notes for Developing Procedures to Investigate Research Misconduct Allegations in International Collaborative Research Project’¹ and other appropriate documents, including: (specify the national codes of conduct and disciplinary or national ethical guidelines that apply);

that any suspected deviation from these standards, in particular alleged research misconduct, will be brought to the immediate attention of (all designated contact point(s)) and investigated according to the policies and procedures of (to be filled in with the body with primary responsibility), while respecting the laws and sovereignty of the States of all participating parties;

to cooperate in and support any such investigations and to accept (subject to any appeal process) the conclusions of any such investigation and to take appropriate actions.

During the development of this Code, the following document was drawn upon: *The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity*, developed by the European Science Foundation (ESF)

¹www.oecd.org/dataoecd/42/34/42770261.pdf

and All European Academies (ALLEA) and published, after many years of work, in 2010 (revised in 2017). It is recommended as a model to be used for the development of codes in individual European Union countries.

The following works were also utilized: *Dobra praktyka badań naukowych – Rekomendacje* (Good Research Practice: Recommendations), drawn up by the Science Ethics Team of the Scientific Research Committee (2000), and *Dobre obyczaje w nauce – Zbiór zasad i wytycznych* (Good Research Practice: A Set of Principles and Guidelines), drawn up by the Committee on Ethics in Science, Polish Academy of Sciences (2001).