

FAIRS report

Quantitative data: Rounds 1 and 2

Dorothy V. M. Bishop

30 June, 2025

Summary of FAIRS Survey, rounds 1 and 2

For background to the survey, please see the protocol here: <https://osf.io/rycqb/>.

For interim reports from Rounds 1 and 2 that include free text comments please see here: <https://osf.io/mzjsh/>.

Self-identification of group for Rounds 1 and 2.

| Round 2 | | | | |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|---------|
| Round 1 | 1_S | 2_R | 3_O | missing |
| 1_S | 29 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 2_R | 1 | 20 | 5 | 7 |
| 3_O | 5 | 2 | 14 | 4 |
| missing | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

N.B. For this report, the Round 2 self-categorisation is used in the tables below when computing percentages endorsing each item for both Round 1 and Round 2 data. In the original Round 1 report (Supplement 7), the Round 1 categorisation was used, so there are some slight discrepancies.

Burdens of serious research misconduct

ITEM 2

Round 1 and 2: How common is the problem of serious research misconduct? (select one)

Round 1: Item 2

| Multiple choice option | S | R | O | All |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| Serious research misconduct is rare relative to the amount of published research literature | 14.3 | 45.5 | 38.1 | 29.5 |
| Serious research misconduct is becoming more prevalent and starting to pose a threat to the research literature | 11.4 | 40.9 | 23.8 | 23.1 |
| Serious research misconduct is already common enough to pose a major threat to the research literature | 74.3 | 13.6 | 38.1 | 47.4 |

Round 2: Item 2

| Multiple choice option | S | R | O | All |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| Serious research misconduct is rare relative to the amount of published research literature | 11.1 | 40.9 | 38.1 | 26.6 |
| Serious research misconduct is becoming more prevalent and starting to pose a threat to the research literature | 16.7 | 36.4 | 33.3 | 26.6 |
| Serious research misconduct is already common enough to pose a major threat to the research literature | 72.2 | 22.7 | 28.6 | 46.8 |

ITEM 3

Round 1 and 2: How harmful are the impacts of serious research misconduct to different segments of society? Please code as 1 (low harm) to 5 (strong harm)

Round 1: Item 3 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| A) Consumers of research findings, e.g. patients whose treatment is informed by medical research or policy-makers who depend on research findings | 71.4 | 72.7 | 90.5 | 76.8 |
| B) Other researchers who try to build on fraudulent findings | 77.1 | 81.8 | 81.0 | 80.0 |
| C) Funders, whose funds are wasted | 80.0 | 63.6 | 33.3 | 60.0 |
| D) Institutions, whose resources are diverted to tackling misconduct | 28.6 | 50.0 | 9.5 | 31.6 |
| E) Society, when public trust in research is eroded | 65.7 | 59.1 | 85.7 | 69.5 |

Round 2: Item 3 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|---|------|-------|-------|------|
| A) Consumers of research findings, e.g. patients whose treatment is informed by medical research or policy-makers who depend on research findings | 77.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 89.9 |
| B) Other researchers who try to build on fraudulent findings | 80.6 | 95.5 | 71.4 | 82.3 |
| C) Other researchers who are based in the same lab, or collaborate with, a fraudulent researcher | 80.6 | 77.3 | 61.9 | 74.7 |
| D) Funders, whose funds are wasted | 69.4 | 77.3 | 42.9 | 64.6 |

Goals of those responding to serious research misconduct

ITEM 4

Round 1: In responding to serious research misconduct, several goals may be considered. Please rate how important each of these is, from 1 (unimportant) to 4 (very important).

Round 1: Item 4 (% responding 4)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| A) To maintain academic integrity, including to correct the academic record | 77.1 | 90.9 | 52.4 | 72.6 |
| B) To punish offenders | 11.4 | 9.1 | 14.3 | 11.6 |
| C) To deter others from committing fraud | 37.1 | 22.7 | 38.1 | 35.8 |
| D) To maintain trust and rigour in research | 60.0 | 77.3 | 90.5 | 75.8 |

Round 2: In responding to serious research misconduct, several goals may be considered. Please rate how important each of these is, from 1 (unimportant) to 5 (very important). Note that in Round 2, for consistency with other items, the responses were on a scale of 1-5, rather than 1-4. Option B (to punish offenders) had so little support in Round 1, that it was omitted in Round 2.

Round 2: Item 4 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|--|------|------|------|------|
| A) To correct the academic record | 86.1 | 86.4 | 71.4 | 82.3 |
| B) To deter others from committing fraud | 72.2 | 59.1 | 76.2 | 69.6 |
| C) To maintain public trust in research | 52.8 | 77.3 | 85.7 | 68.4 |

Factors hindering academic institutions' response to serious research misconduct

ITEM 5

Rounds 1 and 2: Various factors may hinder academic institutions' response to serious research misconduct. Please rate the following from 1 (not much of a hindrance) to 5 (substantial hindrance). In Round 2, subitems F ('Large number of vexatious accusations') and I ('Due process concerns') were dropped because of a low level of support in Round 1.

Round 1: Item 5 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| A) Lack of co-ordination between relevant research actors, such as institutions, funders and publishers | 60.0 | 55.0 | 50.0 | 53.3 |
| B) Conflict of interest for institutions investigating their own researchers | 88.6 | 47.6 | 57.1 | 67.0 |
| C) Lack of resources | 28.6 | 63.6 | 33.3 | 43.2 |
| D) Lack of expertise | 51.4 | 61.9 | 33.3 | 50.0 |
| E) Concern about legal repercussions | 58.8 | 52.4 | 42.9 | 55.4 |
| F) Large number of vexatious/trivial accusations of misconduct | 8.6 | 25.0 | 14.3 | 17.2 |
| G) Bureaucratic delays or inefficiencies in the investigation process | 42.9 | 42.9 | 61.9 | 51.1 |
| H) Complexity of cases | 37.1 | 57.1 | 38.1 | 45.7 |
| I) Due process concerns to ensure fairness to all involved in the case | 20.0 | 42.9 | 38.1 | 34.0 |

Round 2: Item 5 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| A) Lack of co-ordination between relevant research actors, such as institutions, funders and publishers | 69.4 | 66.7 | 61.9 | 66.7 |
| B) Conflict of interest for institutions investigating their own researchers | 91.7 | 52.4 | 52.4 | 70.5 |
| C) Lack of resources | 38.9 | 76.2 | 47.6 | 51.3 |
| D) Lack of expertise | 55.6 | 57.1 | 47.6 | 53.8 |
| E) Concern about legal repercussions | 61.1 | 47.6 | 47.6 | 53.8 |
| F) Bureaucratic delays or inefficiencies in the investigation process | 65.7 | 52.4 | 81.0 | 66.2 |
| G) Complexity of cases | 41.7 | 36.4 | 61.9 | 45.6 |

Factors driving serious research misconduct

ITEM 6

What is the impact of these factors in encouraging researchers to commit serious research misconduct? Please rate from 1 (little impact) to 5 (large impact).

Round 1: Item 6 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| A) Low probability of being detected and/or reported | 85.7 | 40.9 | 61.9 | 62.1 |
| B) Low probability of being punished if detected and/or reported | 62.9 | 40.9 | 42.9 | 48.4 |
| C) 'Publish or perish' culture and incentive structure in research (e.g. progression, promotion, recognition) | 80.0 | 81.8 | 81.0 | 80.0 |
| D) Fear of losing one's job if not sufficiently productive in publishing in prestigious journals | 48.6 | 68.2 | 71.4 | 63.2 |

Round 2: Item 6 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|--|------|------|------|------|
| A) Low probability of being detected and/or reported | 86.1 | 54.5 | 61.9 | 70.9 |
| B) Low probability of being punished if detected and/or reported | 77.8 | 40.9 | 52.4 | 60.8 |
| C) Culture and incentive structure in research (e.g. progression, promotion, recognition) | 91.7 | 95.5 | 81.0 | 89.9 |
| D) Fear of losing one's job if not sufficiently productive in publishing in prestigious journals | 52.8 | 63.6 | 66.7 | 59.5 |

Role of post-publication peer review

ITEM 7

Round 1: On balance, the role of social media in detecting and reporting serious research misconduct has been: (select one)

Round 1: Item 7

| Multiple choice option | S | R | O | All |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| predominantly negative - it makes it too easy for vexatious individuals to raise unwarranted complaints, often under the guise of anonymity | 8.6 | 31.8 | 23.8 | 19.2 |
| neither positive nor negative on balance | 31.4 | 40.9 | 47.6 | 38.5 |
| positive - it provides a route for speedy commentary when concerns are discovered | 60.0 | 27.3 | 28.6 | 42.3 |

Round 2: Please rate the impact of the following from 1 = strongly negative to 5 = strongly positive in drawing attention to serious academic misconduct. This item was reworded on

the basis of comments from Round 1, which noted that ‘social media’ was too broad to be useful.

Round 2: Item 7 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|--|------|------|------|------|
| A) PubPeer - a platform that allows anonymous comments from posters with an academic email address, and is moderated | 80.6 | 63.6 | 52.4 | 68.4 |
| B) Social media such as X, Bluesky, Threads, Facebook, where anyone can post comments without moderation | 52.8 | 22.7 | 19.0 | 35.4 |
| C) Blogs/websites, where a specific author can create an archive of content relating to serious research misconduct | 66.7 | 45.5 | 42.9 | 54.4 |

Reporting serious research misconduct

ITEM 8

Round 1: Official channels for reporting misconduct are often slow and obstructive (select one option)

Round 1: Item 8

| Multiple choice option | S | R | O | All |
|----------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Strongly disagree | 0.0 | 13.6 | 0.0 | 3.8 |
| Moderately disagree | 0.0 | 13.6 | 0.0 | 3.8 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 0.0 | 27.3 | 33.3 | 16.7 |
| Moderately agree | 34.3 | 36.4 | 23.8 | 32.1 |
| Strongly agree | 65.7 | 9.1 | 42.9 | 43.6 |

Round 2: Official channels for reporting misconduct seldom work efficiently. The item was reworded in Round 2 to be more objective.

Round 2: Item 8

| Subitem | 1_S | 2_R | 3_O | All |
|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Moderately/strongly agree | 94.4 | 22.7 | 61.9 | 65.8 |

Models for addressing serious research misconduct

ITEM 9

Round 1: Rank these in order from 1 = most preferred, to 4 = least preferred.

N.B. Several respondents noted this was confusing, because when RANKING options, 1 was regarded as most preferred, whereas elsewhere a high rating corresponded to positive preference. This item was recoded prior to analysis (see above), so the percentages in the Table show those ranking 1. The format was changed in Round 2.

Round 1: Item 9 (% responding 1)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|--|------|------|------|------|
| A) Self-regulation approach, where academic institutions are responsible for conducting investigations and determining sanctions when one of their staff is accused | 22.9 | 18.2 | 42.9 | 24.2 |
| B) National governance approach, where government regulatory agency is set up for this purpose | 22.9 | 13.6 | 23.8 | 18.9 |
| C) National guidelines approach; for example, UK's Committee for Research Integrity, which does not have a regulatory role, but aims to ensure all institutions work to a common framework | 22.9 | 40.9 | 9.5 | 25.3 |
| D) Regulatory agency independent of Government | 34.3 | 22.7 | 33.3 | 30.5 |

Round 2: In an ideal world where resources are not an issue, which is the most suitable model/system for addressing serious research misconduct? Rate these options where 1 = least preferred and 5 = most preferred.

Note that additional options were added in Round 2, based on responses to Round 1. (Despite the change in wording, at least one respondent thought they were being asked to rank order the options, rather than rate them).

Round 2: Item 9 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|--|------|------|------|------|
| A) Self-regulation approach, where academic institutions are responsible for conducting investigations and determining sanctions when one of their staff is accused | 27.8 | 63.6 | 42.9 | 41.8 |
| B) National governance approach, where government regulatory agency is set up for this purpose | 36.1 | 36.4 | 38.1 | 36.7 |
| C) National guidelines approach; for example, UK's Committee for Research Integrity, which does not have a regulatory role, but aims to ensure all institutions work to a common framework | 36.1 | 77.3 | 57.1 | 53.2 |
| D) Regulatory agency independent of Government | 75.0 | 59.1 | 47.6 | 63.3 |
| E) International regulatory agency with stakeholders from different scientific backgrounds, different scientific roles and different continents. | 55.6 | 36.4 | 33.3 | 44.3 |
| F) Similar to industry: in-house quality control but accountable to state regulatory agency | 44.4 | 40.9 | 52.4 | 45.6 |
| G) A body similar to Health and Safety Executive that could bring criminal prosecutions for serious research misconduct. | 52.8 | 27.3 | 57.1 | 46.8 |

Role of employers

Item 10

Rounds 1 and 2: Prospective employers should undertake rigorous due diligence and, as far as possible, check with previous employers to ask if there have been any investigations into serious research misconduct (multiple choice options). The Agree option was split in Round 2 on the basis of comments from Round 1.

Round 1: Item 10

| Multiple choice option | S | R | O | All |
|------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Disagree | 2.9 | 13.6 | 14.3 | 9.0 |
| Neutral | 14.3 | 4.5 | 14.3 | 11.5 |
| Agree | 82.9 | 81.8 | 71.4 | 79.5 |

Round 2: Item 10

| Multiple choice option | S | R | O | All |
|--|------|------|------|------|
| Disagree | 5.6 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 3.8 |
| Neutral | 11.1 | 13.6 | 14.3 | 12.7 |
| Agree, but only if investigation found evidence of serious research misconduct | 33.3 | 59.1 | 66.7 | 49.4 |
| Agree, regardless of outcome of investigation | 50.0 | 22.7 | 19.0 | 34.2 |

Legal obligations of employers

Item 11

Rounds 1 and 2: Employers, funders and publishers of research should be legally required to share information to support investigations of serious research misconduct. (3 point scale for Round 1 changed to 5 point scale for Round 2, for consistency with other ratings).

Round 1: Item 11

| Multiple choice option | S | R | O | All |
|------------------------|------|------|-------|------|
| Agree | 71.4 | 77.3 | 100.0 | 80.8 |

Round 2: Item 11

| Multiple choice option | S | R | O | All |
|------------------------|------|------|-----|------|
| Agree/Strongly agree | 88.9 | 81.8 | 100 | 89.9 |

Solutions to serious research misconduct

ITEM 12

Rounds 1 and 2: Given that we have finite resources, which solutions to serious research misconduct should be prioritised in funding?

In Round 1, the options were worded as 1 = most preferred, to 5 = least preferred. With hindsight this was very confusing, and respondents in Round 1 may have interpreted this as a request to rank order the options. For this report, the Round 1 scores have been rescaled so that the table shows those rating the option as 1 or 2.

Round 1: Item 12 (% responding 1 or 2)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|--|------|------|------|------|
| A) Changing criteria for hiring/promotion/funding away from publish/perish model, so that researchers won't be motivated to commit fraud | 42.9 | 54.5 | 47.6 | 44.2 |
| B) Research ethics training for all researchers | 37.1 | 50.0 | 19.0 | 36.8 |
| C) Funding/training of research integrity officers | 28.6 | 40.9 | 28.6 | 36.8 |
| D) Infrastructure to collect and report on serious research misconduct nationally | 42.9 | 36.4 | 42.9 | 42.1 |
| E) Support for individuals/organisations who have expertise in detection of serious research misconduct | 51.4 | 31.8 | 42.9 | 46.3 |

In Round 2, the same wording was used, except that the response options were 1 = totally ineffective to 5 = highly effective.

Round 2: Item 12 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|--|------|------|------|------|
| A) Changing criteria for hiring/promotion/funding away from publish/perish model, so that researchers won't be motivated to commit fraud | 66.7 | 81.8 | 61.9 | 69.6 |
| B) Research integrity training for all researchers | 19.4 | 72.7 | 33.3 | 38.0 |
| C) Funding/training of research integrity officers | 51.4 | 65.0 | 57.1 | 56.6 |
| D) Infrastructure to collect data and report on serious research misconduct nationally | 66.7 | 54.5 | 66.7 | 63.3 |
| E) Support for individuals/organisations who have expertise in detection of serious research misconduct | 72.2 | 59.1 | 81.0 | 70.9 |

Role of publishers

ITEM 13.

Round 1: It is not the responsibility of publishers or journal editors to determine whether serious research misconduct has occurred, but they are responsible for ensuring the literature is decontaminated from erroneous work promptly. Please rate the following statements in accordance with your views on how this should work, from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

Round 1: Item 13 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| A) Articles that contain serious errors that undermine confidence in the findings should be retracted promptly, without waiting for an institutional investigation | 82.9 | 59.1 | 57.1 | 66.3 |
| B) Publishers and institutions should work together to facilitate sharing of key information when serious research misconduct is suspected | 88.6 | 86.4 | 85.0 | 88.2 |
| C) If conditions for retraction are not met, an expression of concern may be added to an article while an institution conducts an investigation | 71.4 | 90.5 | 38.1 | 67.0 |
| D) When an institutional investigation is completed, the institution should directly approach the publisher of articles affected by severe research misconduct and request retraction | 91.4 | 90.9 | 90.5 | 91.6 |
| E) When a publisher finds the same author repeatedly flagged for erroneous material, they should communicate this to research integrity officer at the author's institution | 80.0 | 90.5 | 95.2 | 88.3 |
| F) When a publisher or institution finds the same researcher repeatedly flagged for erroneous material, their name should be added to a database. (NB. If there is sufficient endorsement of this statement, there would need to be discussion of how this works in terms of legal, practical and ethical aspects.) | 51.4 | 40.9 | 60.0 | 54.3 |

For Round 2, the wording was modified because some respondents objected to the premise of the first sentence. Accordingly, this statement was incorporated as another subitem. However, that proved to be a poor decision, as it involved rating a negatively worded item, which can be confusing. The revised wording for the item was: Publishers and their journal editors are responsible for ensuring the literature is decontaminated from erroneous work promptly. Please rate the following statements in accordance with your views on how this should work, from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

Round 2: Item 13 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| A) It is NOT the responsibility of publishers or journal editors to determine whether serious research misconduct has occurred | 19.4 | 31.8 | 23.8 | 24.1 |
| B) Articles that contain serious errors that undermine confidence in the findings should be retracted promptly, without waiting for an institutional investigation | 80.6 | 54.5 | 66.7 | 69.6 |
| C) Publishers and institutions should work together to facilitate sharing of key information when serious research misconduct is suspected | 94.4 | 86.4 | 90.5 | 91.1 |
| D) If conditions for retraction are not met, an expression of concern may be added to an article while an institution conducts an investigation | 83.3 | 71.4 | 52.4 | 71.8 |
| E) When an institutional investigation is completed, the institution should directly approach the publisher of articles affected by severe research misconduct and request retraction | 97.2 | 90.9 | 100 | 96.2 |
| F) When a publisher finds the same author repeatedly flagged for erroneous material, they should communicate this to research integrity officer at the author's institution | 80.6 | 95.5 | 90.5 | 87.3 |
| G) When a publisher or institution finds the same researcher repeatedly flagged for erroneous material, their name should be added to a database. (NB. If there is sufficient endorsement of this statement, there would need to be discussion of how this works in terms of legal, practical and ethical aspects.) | 52.8 | 40.9 | 57.1 | 50.6 |

Whistleblowers and bystanders

ITEM 14

Rounds 1 and 2: Please rate your agreement with the following statements about whistleblowers from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The last two subitems were reordered in Round 2, as the 'collateral damage' issue seemed separate from the other issues.

Round 1: Item 14 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| A) There are disincentives for researchers to report serious research misconduct | 85.7 | 54.5 | 71.4 | 72.6 |
| B) Usually there is insufficient protection for whistleblowers who report serious research misconduct | 68.6 | 45.5 | 66.7 | 63.2 |
| C) It is important to be aware of and mitigate collateral damage that may be caused to other members of a research group if one member is found to have committed serious research misconduct | 68.6 | 81.8 | 71.4 | 75.8 |
| D) Whistleblowers should have their identities protected, with confidential channels for reporting suspected serious research misconduct | 77.1 | 77.3 | 81.0 | 80.0 |

Round 2: Item 14 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| A) There are disincentives for researchers to report serious research misconduct | 86.1 | 63.6 | 61.9 | 73.4 |
| B) Usually there is insufficient protection for whistleblowers who report serious research misconduct | 86.1 | 63.6 | 76.2 | 77.2 |
| C) Whistleblowers should have their identities protected, with confidential channels for reporting suspected serious research misconduct | 86.1 | 72.7 | 71.4 | 78.5 |
| D) It is important to mitigate collateral damage that may be caused to other members of a research group if one member is found to have committed serious research misconduct | 72.2 | 81.8 | 85.7 | 78.5 |

When serious research misconduct is confirmed

ITEM 15

Rounds 1 and 2: Which of these practices should be options for institutions when serious research misconduct is confirmed. Please give your rating from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree

Round 1: Item 15 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|--|------|------|------|------|
| A) Educational retraining for researchers who have been found to commit serious research misconduct | 31.4 | 68.2 | 33.3 | 45.3 |
| B) Restorative justice approaches; e.g. requirement to meet those affected by the misconduct to discuss its impact | 42.9 | 36.4 | 52.4 | 45.3 |
| C) Sanctions such as demotion or dismissal | 88.6 | 68.2 | 76.2 | 80.0 |
| D) Report on the investigation made public, with identities of those found to have committed serious research misconduct disclosed | 82.9 | 72.7 | 81.0 | 78.9 |

Round 2: Item 15 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|--|------|------|------|------|
| A) Educational retraining for researchers who have been found to commit serious research misconduct | 33.3 | 86.4 | 52.4 | 53.2 |
| B) Restorative justice approaches; e.g. requirement to meet those affected by the misconduct to discuss its impact | 38.9 | 63.6 | 52.4 | 49.4 |
| C) Sanctions such as demotion or dismissal | 91.7 | 72.7 | 81.0 | 83.5 |
| D) Report on the investigation made public, with identities of those found to have committed serious research misconduct disclosed | 86.1 | 63.6 | 71.4 | 75.9 |

Unintended consequences/barriers to progress

ITEM 16

Rounds 1 and 2: Please rate your agreement with the following statements about unintended consequences/barriers to progress from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. In Round 2, an explanation was added in response to a comment on Round 1, stating “This question is about what you perceive as the current state of affairs.”

Round 1: Item 16 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|--|------|------|------|------|
| A) Fear of reputational harm makes institutions less likely to take action on serious research misconduct | 91.4 | 40.9 | 85.7 | 76.8 |
| B) Investigations of serious research misconduct divert researchers and associated resources from more productive research work | 20.0 | 27.3 | 23.8 | 26.3 |
| C) There is a danger that structures developed to investigate serious research misconduct could be weaponised by those with political agendas - e.g. on topics such as vaccination, climate change, sexual health. | 51.4 | 45.5 | 52.4 | 49.5 |
| D) Failure to address serious research misconduct at the institutional/employer level could lead to more bureaucracy from external agencies | 45.7 | 59.1 | 57.1 | 57.9 |

Round 2: Item 16 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|--|------|------|------|------|
| A) Fear of reputational harm makes institutions less likely to take action on serious research misconduct | 91.7 | 59.1 | 71.4 | 77.2 |
| B) Investigations of serious research misconduct divert researchers and associated resources from more productive research work | 27.8 | 31.8 | 23.8 | 27.8 |
| C) There is a danger that structures developed to investigate serious research misconduct could be weaponised by those with political agendas - e.g. on topics such as vaccination, climate change, sexual health. | 50.0 | 45.5 | 52.4 | 49.4 |
| D) Failure to address serious research misconduct at the institutional/employer level could lead to more bureaucracy from external agencies | 69.4 | 52.4 | 61.9 | 62.8 |

Final item

ITEM 17

Round 1: “One of the likely drivers of trust and distrust in research is the way research institutes, publishers, and funders respond to allegations of research misconduct” (Bouter, 2024). This item was intended to get a final overall impression of the key issues in the field.

Round 1: Item 17

| Multiple choice option | S | R | O | All |
|------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Disagree | 17.1 | 22.7 | 0.0 | 14.1 |
| Neutral | 20.0 | 18.2 | 19.0 | 19.2 |
| Agree | 62.9 | 59.1 | 81.0 | 66.7 |

Round 2: To conclude the survey, respondents were invited to express their interest in a range of possible topics for discussion, i.e. How interested would you be in having discussion of the following topics at the in-person meeting in April? Rate from 1 = not at all interested to 5 strongly interested.

Round 2: Item 17 (% responding 4 or 5)

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| A) 1. Can we specify a study design that would provide better estimates of prevalence of research fraud? | 41.7 | 20.0 | 52.4 | 39.0 |
| B) 2. What should institutions consider when looking at costs and benefits of misconduct investigations? | 16.7 | 38.1 | 52.4 | 32.1 |
| C) 3. Getting ahead of the problem: the role of AI in research fraud | 41.7 | 66.7 | 70.0 | 55.8 |
| D) 4. Steps towards a universal approach to investigations of research misconduct | 69.4 | 76.2 | 81.0 | 74.4 |
| E) 5. Whose responsibility is it to organise/pay for research integrity investigations? | 44.4 | 38.1 | 35.0 | 40.3 |
| F) 6. Why do they do it? Explanations for research misconduct and implications for solutions | 41.7 | 61.9 | 47.6 | 48.7 |
| G) 7. How best to defend against weaponisation of research for political/pseudoscientific objectives. | 33.3 | 61.9 | 71.4 | 51.3 |
| H) 8. How to design post-publication peer review to accentuate the benefits and protect against weaponisation | 61.1 | 52.4 | 57.1 | 57.7 |
| I) 9. Are there "off the shelf" procedures for investigating research misconduct that have been developed by one country and could be extended to others? | 50.0 | 61.9 | 47.6 | 52.6 |
| J) 10. Whose responsibility is it to ensure procedures for research misconduct investigations are followed? | 47.2 | 52.4 | 38.1 | 46.2 |
| K) 11. Is it possible to reconcile legal requirements for privacy with need for transparency in research misconduct investigations? | 42.9 | 71.4 | 38.1 | 49.4 |

| Subitem | S | R | O | All |
|--|------|------|------|------|
| L) 12. How can we move from "publish or perish" culture? Is open research part of the answer? | 63.9 | 68.2 | 71.4 | 67.1 |
| M) 13. Could we achieve a common international framework for collecting accurate data on rates of research misconduct? What would be the benefits? | 57.1 | 33.3 | 47.6 | 48.1 |
| N) 14. Is a publishers' database of "repeat offenders" feasible and/or desirable? | 50.0 | 38.1 | 33.3 | 42.3 |
| O) 15. What should be the conditions for retracting a paper? How should publishers use other options, such as Expression of Concern, or Investigation Pending? | 66.7 | 61.9 | 50.0 | 61.0 |
| P) 16. What policies can we develop for mitigating collateral damage caused to other members of a research group and/or collaborators who get caught up when a colleague is found to have committed serious research misconduct? | 36.1 | 61.9 | 47.6 | 46.2 |
| Q) 17. Can we agree on definitions of key terminology, like research culture, integrity, ethics, misconduct, governance, open research | 30.6 | 54.5 | 38.1 | 39.2 |
| R) 18. Should the law be involved in cases of serious research misconduct, and if so how? | 47.2 | 50.0 | 20.0 | 41.0 |
| S) 19. What methods are effective for detecting serious research misconduct? | 72.2 | 77.3 | 81.0 | 75.9 |
| T) 20. What can research funders do to prevent and/or address serious research misconduct? | 63.9 | 42.9 | 38.1 | 51.3 |