Leibniz Institute of Agricultural Development
in Transition Economies

Guideline for Good Scientific Practice and Rules of Procedure for Dealing with Scientific Misconduct at the Leibniz Institute of Agricultural Development in Transition Economies (IAMO)

(version 29.06.2021)

- Inofficial English translation -

Adopted by the IAMO directorate on 14 June 2021 during their meeting regarding the implementation of the Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice (Code of Conduct) of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)

Preamble

IAMO commits itself to the Leibniz Code for Good Research Practice (Leibniz Association 2021) and the respective valid Guideline on Good Scientific Practice of the Leibniz Association (2019a) and recognises the Code "Guidelines for Ensuring Good Scientific Practice" of the DFG (DFG 2019a) in the respective current version as a legally binding reference for their application. All employees of IAMO are obliged to comply with the Code. IAMO informs their staff comprehensively about the Code and offers supportive advice and necessary training to ensure compliance.

IAMO ensures the implementation of the Code with institute-specific concepts and agreements that serve to ensure good scientific practice as defined in the Code. The full text of the Code is integrated into this IAMO Guideline. In the following, the 19 guidelines of the DFG Code (levels 1 and 2), which IAMO fully recognises, are concretised by IAMO-specific explanations. These concretisations primarily specify the election procedure of the ombudspersons, their tasks and powers, as well as the procedures for ensuring good scientific practice and dealing with allegations of scientific misconduct in accordance with the guidelines of the Leibniz Association. Furthermore, possibilities for sanctions at the institute level in the event of scientific misconduct by IAMO employees are described in more detail.

This regulation comes into force on the day after its publication. It replaces IAMO's previous rules on good scientific practice of 27.05.2002.

Guideline 1: Commitment to the general principles

► IAMO, with the participation of their members, defines rules of good research practice, ensure that their employees are made aware of these guidelines and related policies and regulations, and require their employees to comply with them with due regard for the type of research undertaken in the relevant subject area. Individual researchers are responsible for ensuring that their own conduct complies with the standards of good research practice.

Explanations:

In particular, the principles include working lege artis, maintaining strict honesty in attributing one's own contributions and those of others, rigorously questioning all findings, and permitting and promoting critical discourse within the research community. The principles of good research practice are set out in the following guidelines.

Guideline 2: Professional ethics

► Researchers are responsible for putting the fundamental values and norms of research into practice and advocating for them. Education in the principles of good research begins at the earliest possible stage in academic teaching and research training. Researchers at all career levels regularly update their knowledge about the standards of good research practice and the current state of the art.

Explanations:

Experienced and early career researchers support each other in a process of continuous mutual learning and ongoing training and maintain a regular dialogue.

Guideline 3: Organisational responsibility of heads of research institutions

► The IAMO management creates the basic framework for research. They are responsible for ensuring adherence to and the promotion of good practice, and for appropriate career support for all researchers. The heads of IAMO guarantee the necessary conditions to enable researchers to comply with legal and ethical standards. The basic framework includes clear written policies and procedures for staff selection and development as well as for early career support and equal opportunity.

Explanations and concretisation:

The IAMO management is responsible for ensuring that an appropriate organisational structure is in place at the institution. They ensure that the tasks of leadership, supervision, quality assurance and conflict management are clearly allocated in accordance with the size of individual research work units and suitably communicated to members and employees.

Transparent and fair staff selection and development are ensured at IAMO by the principles for staff selection laid down in writing in the service agreement on staff appointments at IAMO (Staffing Guidelines). Gender equality and the diversity of the staff as well as the avoidance of

unconscious bias are explicitly taken into account.

Suitable supervisory structures and policies are established for early career researchers. Honest career advice, training opportunities and mentoring are offered to researchers and research support staff.

Guideline 4: Responsibility of the heads of research work units

► The head of a research work unit is responsible for the entire unit. Collaboration within the unit is designed such that the group as a whole can perform its tasks, the necessary cooperation and coordination can be achieved, and all members understand their roles, rights and duties. The leadership role includes ensuring adequate individual supervision of early career researchers, integrated in the overall institutional policy, as well as career development for researchers and research support staff. Suitable organisational measures are in place at the level of the individual unit and of the leadership of the institution to prevent the abuse of power and exploitation of dependent relationships.

Explanations and concretisation:

The size and the organisation of the unit are designed to allow leadership tasks, particularly skills training, research support and supervisory duties, to be performed appropriately. The performance of leadership tasks is associated with a corresponding responsibility. Researchers and research support staff benefit from a balance of support and personal responsibility appropriate to their career level. They are given adequate status with corresponding rights of participation. Through gradually increasing autonomy, they are empowered to shape their career.

IAMO's concept for the promotion of young researchers describes the supervision structures and concepts established at IAMO. Each doctoral researcher is assigned at least one academic supervisor and one other qualified person. These are responsible for the appropriate supervision of the qualification work in accordance with the rules of good scientific practice, the communication of development and qualification opportunities and the promotion of presentation and publication opportunities. A supervision agreement is binding for all doctoral researchers and should be signed by them and their supervisors within the first three months of the doctoral phase. Additions and revisions are possible by mutual agreement. Following the supplement to the 2019 Guideline on Career Development in the Leibniz Association for the Doctoral Phase (Leibniz-Gemeinschaft 2019b), the quality of supervision is ensured by a four- or multi-eye principle with supervisory teams. As a rule, individually tailored "Thesis Advisory Committees" are established, which meet regularly for a transparent review of the progress of the doctoral thesis. A detailed description is set out in the current version of IAMO's "Concept for the Promotion of Young Researchers".

Guideline 5: Dimensions of performance and assessment criteria

► To assess the performance of researchers, a multidimensional approach is called for; in addition to academic and scientific achievements, other aspects may be taken into consideration. Performance is assessed primarily on the basis of qualitative measures, while quantitative indicators may be incorporated into the overall assessment only with appropriate differentiation and reflection. Where provided voluntarily, individual circumstances stated in curricula vitae – as well as the categories specified in the German General Equal Treatment Act (Allgemeines Gleichbehandlungsgesetz) – are taken into account when forming a judgement.

Explanations:

High-quality research is oriented towards criteria specific to individual disciplines. In addition to the generation of and critical reflection on findings, other aspects of performance are taken into consideration in the evaluation process. Examples include involvement in teaching, academic self-governance, public relations, and knowledge and technology transfer; contributions to the general good of society may also be recognised. An individual's approach to research, such as an openness to new findings and a willingness to take risks, is also considered. Appropriate allowance is made for periods of absence due to personal, family or health reasons or for prolonged training or qualification phases resulting from such periods, and for alternative career paths or similar circumstances.

Guideline 6: Ombudspersons

► The IAMO researchers appoint at least one independent ombudsperson to whom their members and employees can turn with questions relating to good research practice and in cases of suspected misconduct. They take sufficient care to ensure that people are aware of who the ombudspersons at the institution are. For each ombudsperson there must be a designated substitute in case there is any concern about conflicts of interest or in case the ombudsperson is unable to carry out his or her duties.

Explanations and concretisation:

Ombudspersons may not serve as members of the IAMO directorate while serving in this role. The term of office of ombudspersons is limited to four years. A further term of office is possible. Scientists with integrity and management experience are eligible to be selected as ombudspersons. All IAMO scientists with a first university degree qualifying them for a profession are eligible for nomination of ombudspersons.

A nomination will only be considered if the nominee has declared his/her willingness to accept the office. The ombudspersons should be elected from among IAMO's scientist. In exceptional cases, a scientist who is not a member of the institute may also be elected. If possible, the ombudspersons should not belong to the same department. The appointment of the ombudspersons shall be announced publicly on the institute's website and on the intranet, stating how to reach them.

The ombudspersons advise as neutral and qualified contact persons in questions of good scientific practice and in suspected cases of scientific misconduct and contribute, as far as possible, to solution-oriented conflict mediation. The ombudspersons accept enquiries while maintaining confidentiality and, if necessary, forward suspected cases of scientific misconduct to the responsible body, usually an investigative commission, at their institution. The two ombudspersons may exchange information for the purpose of mutual consultation, unless explicitly requested otherwise.

The ombudspersons exercise their office in an honorary capacity, independently and free of instructions. They are to be supported in the exercise of their office by all stakeholders. The ombudspersons receive the necessary related support and acceptance from IAMO in the performance of their duties. They are supported by the institution in obtaining appropriate qualifications. In order to increase the functionality of the ombudsperson system, the institution provides for measures to relieve the ombudspersons in other ways.

IAMO scientists are free to turn to the DFG's "Ombudsman for Science" body or the Leibniz Association's central ombudsman body instead of IAMO's ombudspersons.

Guideline 7: Cross-phase quality assurance

► Researchers carry out each step of the research process *lege artis*. When research findings are made publicly available (in the narrower sense of publication, but also in a broader sense through other communication channels), the quality assurance mechanisms used are always explained. This applies especially when new methods are developed.

Explanations:

Continuous quality assurance during the research process includes, in particular, compliance with subject-specific standards and established methods, processes such as equipment calibration, the collection, processing and analysis of research data, the selection and use of research software, software development and programming, and the keeping of laboratory notebooks. If researchers have made their findings publicly available and subsequently become aware of inconsistencies or errors in them, they make the necessary corrections. If the inconsistencies or errors constitute grounds for retracting a publication, the researchers will promptly request the publisher, infrastructure provider, etc. to correct or retract the publication and make a corresponding announcement. The same applies if researchers are made aware of such inconsistencies or errors by third parties. The origin of the data, organisms, materials and software used in the research process is disclosed and the reuse of data is clearly indicated; original sources are cited. The nature and the scope of research data generated during the research process are described. Research data are handled in accordance with the requirements of the relevant subject area. The source code of publicly available software must be persistent, citable and documented. Depending on the particular subject area, it is an essential part of quality assurance that results or findings can be replicated or confirmed by other researchers (for example with the aid of a detailed description of materials and methods).

Guideline 8: Stakeholders, responsibilities and roles

► The roles and responsibilities of the researchers and research support staff participating in a research project must be clear at each stage of the project.

Explanations and concretisation:

The participants in a research project engage in regular dialogue. For all research projects at IAMO, the roles and responsibilities of the participants must be clearly defined and adjusted as necessary in consultation with all participants. An adjustment is particularly indicated if the focus of the work of one of the participants in the research project changes. For doctoral projects, roles and responsibilities are set out in writing in a supervision agreement.

Guideline 9: Research design

► Researchers take into account and acknowledge the current state of research when planning a project. To identify relevant and suitable research questions, they familiarise themselves with existing research in the public domain. HEIs and non-HEI research institutions ensure that the necessary basic framework for this is in place.

Explanations:

Methods to avoid (unconscious) distortions in the interpretation of findings, e.g. the use of blinding in experiments, are used where possible. Researchers examine whether and to what extent gender and diversity dimensions may be of significance to the research project (with regard to methods, work programme, objectives, etc.). The context in which the research was conducted is taken into consideration when interpreting findings.

Guideline 10: Legal and ethical frameworks, usage rights

► Researchers adopt a responsible approach to the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of research. They comply with rights and obligations, particularly those arising from legal requirements and contracts with third parties, and where necessary seek approvals and ethics statements and present these when required. With regard to research projects, the potential consequences of the research should be evaluated in detail and the ethical aspects should be assessed. The legal framework of a research project includes documented agreements on usage rights relating to data and results generated by the project.

Explanations:

Researchers maintain a continual awareness of the risks associated with the misuse of research results. Their responsibility is not limited to compliance with legal requirements but also includes an obligation to use their knowledge, experience and skills such that risks can be recognised, assessed and evaluated. The IAMO is responsible for ensuring that its members' and employees' actions comply with regulations and promote this through suitable organisational structures. They provide binding ethical guidance and policies and define procedures to assess ethical issues relating

to research projects.[11] Where possible and practicable, researchers conclude documented agreements on usage rights at the earliest possible point in a research project. Documented agreements are especially useful when multiple academic and/or non-academic institutions are involved in a research project or when it is likely that a researcher will move to a different institution and continue using the data he or she generated for his or her own research purposes. In particular, the researcher who collected the data is entitled to use them. During a research project, those entitled to use the data decide whether third parties should have access to them (subject to data protection regulations).

Guideline 11: Methods and standards

► To answer research questions, researchers use scientifically sound and appropriate methods. When developing and applying new methods, they attach particular importance to quality assurance and the establishment of standards.

Explanations:

The application of a method normally requires specific expertise that is ensured, where necessary, by suitable cooperative arrangements. The establishment of standards for methods, the use of software, the collection of research data and the description of research results is essential for the comparability and transferability of research outcomes.

Guideline 12: Documentation

► Researchers document all information relevant to the production of a research result as clearly as is required by and is appropriate for the relevant subject area to allow the result to be reviewed and assessed. In general, this also includes documenting individual results that do not support the research hypothesis. The selection of results must be avoided. Where subject-specific recommendations exist for review and assessment, researchers create documentation in accordance with these guidelines. If the documentation does not satisfy these requirements, the constraints and the reasons for them are clearly explained. Documentation and research results must not be manipulated; they are protected as effectively as possible against manipulation.

Explanations:

An important basis for enabling replication is to make available the information necessary to understand the research (including the research data used or generated, the methodological, evaluation and analytical steps taken, and, if relevant, the development of the hypothesis), to ensure that citations are clear, and, as far as possible, to enable third parties to access this information. Where research software is being developed, the source code is documented.

[1] IAMO-Code of Research Ethics (21.02.2019), http://de.wiki.iamo.de/images_de/a/a2/Code_of_Research_Ethics.pdf

Guideline 13: Providing public access to research results

► As a rule, researchers make all results available as part of scientific/academic discourse. In specific cases, however, there may be reasons not to make results publicly available (in the narrower sense of publication, but also in a broader sense through other communication channels); this decision must not depend on third parties. Researchers decide autonomously– with due regard for the conventions of the relevant subject area – whether, how and where to disseminate their results. If it has been decided to make results available in the public domain, researchers describe them clearly and in full. Where possible and reasonable, this includes making the research data, materials and information on which the results are based, as well as the methods and software used, available and fully explaining the work processes. Software programmed by researchers themselves is made publicly available along with the source code. Researchers provide full and correct information about their own preliminary work and that of others.

Explanations:

In the interest of transparency and to enable research to be referred to and reused by others, whenever possible researchers make the research data and principal materials on which a publication is based available in recognized archives and repositories in accordance with the FAIR principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable). Restrictions may apply to public availability in the case of patent applications. If self-developed research software is to be made available to third parties, an appropriate license is provided. In line with the principle of "quality over quantity", researchers avoid splitting research into inappropriately small publications. They limit the repetition of content from publications of which they were (co-)authors to that which is necessary to enable the reader to understand the context. They cite results previously made publicly available unless, in exceptional cases, this is deemed unnecessary by the general conventions of the discipline.

Guideline 14: Authorship

► An author is an individual who has made a genuine, identifiable contribution to the content of a research publication of text, data or software. All authors agree on the final version of the work to be published. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, they share responsibility for the publication. Authors seek to ensure that, as far as possible, their contributions are identified by publishers or infrastructure providers such that they can be correctly cited by users.

Explanations:

The contribution must add to the research content of the publication. What constitutes a genuine and identifiable contribution must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and depends on the subject area in question. An identifiable, genuine contribution is deemed to exist particularly in instances in which a researcher – in a research-relevant way – takes part in

- the development and conceptual design of the research project, or
- the gathering, collection, acquisition or provision of data, software or sources, or

- the analysis/evaluation or interpretation of data, sources and conclusions drawn from them, or
- the drafting of the manuscript.

If a contribution is not sufficient to justify authorship, the individual's support may be properly acknowledged in footnotes, a foreword or an acknowledgement. Honorary authorship where no such contribution was made is not permissible. A leadership or supervisory function does not itself constitute co-authorship.

Collaborating researchers agree on authorship of a publication. The decision as to the order in which authors are named is made in good time, normally no later than when the manuscript is drafted, and in accordance with clear criteria that reflect the practices within the relevant subject areas. Researchers may not refuse to give their consent to publication of the results without sufficient grounds. Refusal of consent must be justified with verifiable criticism of data, methods or results.

Guideline 15: Publication medium

► Authors select the publication medium carefully, with due regard for its quality and visibility in the relevant field of discourse. Researchers who assume the role of editor carefully select where they will carry out this activity. The scientific/academic quality of a contribution does not depend on the medium in which it is published.

Explanations:

In addition to publication in books and journals, authors may also consider academic repositories, data and software repositories, and blogs. A new or unknown publication medium is evaluated to assess its seriousness.

A key criterion to selecting a publication medium is whether it has established guidelines on good research practice.

Guideline 16: Confidentiality and neutrality of review processes and discussions

► Fair behavior is the basis for the legitimacy of any judgement-forming process. Researchers who evaluate submitted manuscripts, funding proposals or personal qualifications are obliged to maintain strict confidentiality with regard to this process. They disclose all facts that could give rise to the appearance of a conflict of interest. The duty of confidentiality and disclosure of facts that could give rise to the appearance of a conflict of interest also applies to members of research advisory and decision-making bodies.

Explanations:

The confidentiality of third-party material to which a reviewer or committee member gains access precludes sharing the material with third parties or making personal use of it. Researchers immediately disclose to the responsible body any potential or apparent conflicts of interest, bias or

favoritism relating to the research project being reviewed or the person or matter being discussed.

Guideline 17: Archiving

► Researchers back up research data and results made publicly available, as well as the central materials on which they are based and the research software used, by adequate means according to the standards of the relevant subject area, and retain them for an appropriate period of time. Where justifiable reasons exist for not archiving particular data, researchers explain these reasons. HEIs and non-HEI research institutions ensure that the infrastructure necessary to enable archiving is in place.

Explanations and concretisation:

When scientific and academic findings are made publicly available, the research data (generally raw data) on which they are based are generally archived in an accessible and identifiable manner for a period of ten years at the IAMO where the data were produced or in cross-location repositories. In justified cases, shorter archiving periods may be appropriate; the reasons for this are described clearly and comprehensibly. The archiving period begins on the date when the results are made publicly available. The "Concept for Research Data Management at IAMO" provides further details on the handling of research data.

Guideline 18: Complainants and respondents

► The ombudspersons and investigating committees examining allegations of misconduct take appropriate measures to protect both the complainant and the respondent. The investigation of allegations of research misconduct must be carried out in strict confidentiality and adhere to the presumption of innocence. The information disclosed by the complainant must be provided in good faith. Knowingly false or malicious allegations may themselves constitute misconduct. The disclosure should not disadvantage the research or professional career prospects of either the complainant or the respondent.

Explanations and concretisation:

Particularly in the case of early career researchers, the disclosure should not lead to delays in the complainant's own qualification phase and no disadvantage should arise to the writing of final dissertations or doctoral theses; the same applies to working conditions and possible contract extensions.

The investigating body will respect the presumption of innocence vis-à-vis the respondent at each stage of the process when considering each case. The respondent should not experience any disadvantage resulting from the investigation of the allegation until such time as research misconduct has been formally established. The complainant must have objective reasons for suspecting that an infringement of the standards of good research practice may have occurred.

If the complainant is unable to verify the facts personally, or if there is uncertainty with regard to the interpretation of the guidelines on good research practice in relation to an observed set of circumstances, the complainant should consult the IAMO ombudsperson or the German Research Ombudsman (Gremium „Ombudsman für die Wissenschaft“) to clarify the suspicion.

The IAMO ombudspersons decide whether to investigate anonymous allegations. Disclosures made anonymously can only be investigated if the complainant provides the party investigating the allegation with solid and sufficiently concrete facts.

If the complainant’s identity is known, the investigating body will keep the individual’s name confidential and will not share it with third parties without the individual’s consent. Different requirements apply only if there is a legal obligation or if the respondent cannot otherwise properly defend himself or herself because, as an exception, the case concerns the identity of the complainant. The investigating body will promptly inform the complainant if his or her name is to be disclosed; the complainant can decide whether to withdraw the allegation due to the impending disclosure. The confidentiality of the process is limited if the complainant makes his or her suspicion public. The investigating body will decide on a case-by case basis how to handle the breach of confidentiality on the part of the complainant. Should research misconduct not be proven, the complainant must continue to be protected, assuming that the allegations cannot be shown to have been made against his or her better knowledge.

Should the complainant(s) not wish to contact the IAMO ombudspersons, the Leibniz Association's central ombudsman board (e-mail: ombudsgremium(at)leibniz-gemeinschaft.de; postal address: Leibniz Ombudsgremium, Leibniz Association, Chausseestraße 111, 10115 Berlin) can be contacted for clarification. It is also possible to turn to the "Ombudsman for Science" committee set up by the DFG (https://ombudsman-fuer-die-wissenschaft.de/).

Guideline 19: Procedures in cases of alleged research misconduct

► The IAMO establish procedures to handle allegations of research misconduct. They define policies and regulations on the basis of a sufficient legal foundation. The regulations define the circumstances that constitute misconduct, procedural rules and the measures to take should an allegation be upheld. Regulations are applied in addition to relevant higher-level laws.

Explanations and concretisation:

Not every breach of good research practice constitutes misconduct. Only deliberate or grossly negligent infringements defined in a set of regulations are considered scientific misconduct. Violations in the sense of scientific misconduct are described by the DFG in the Rules of Procedure for Dealing with Scientific Misconduct (DFG 2019b), the Procedural Guide to Good Scientific Practice (DFG 2020) and by the Leibniz Association in the Guideline on Good Scientific Practice in the Leibniz Association (§3) (Leibniz Association 2019a). These documents are used to guide IAMO procedures and possible consequences of violations that apply at IAMO. Particular examples of misconduct

include fabrication of data, falsification of data and plagiarism. The above-mentioned regulations provide guidance regarding the responsibility for each step of a procedure, the consideration of evidence, substitutes for ombudspersons and members of investigation committees, conflicts of interest and the procedural principles of the rule of law.

In cases of suspected scientific misconduct, IAMO applies the following procedure: if IAMO's ombudspersons receive an allegation of scientific misconduct, they conduct a preliminary investigation independently and without delay. The respondent and the complainant are each given the opportunity to be heard at this stage of the process (orally or through a written statement). In order to clarify the facts, they may interview further persons and obtain expert opinions. The person affected by the allegations as well as the whistleblower shall be given the opportunity to comment at each stage of the proceedings. Until such time as it is demonstrated that misconduct has occurred, information relating to the individuals involved in the process and the findings of the investigation is treated in confidence. The IAMO ensures that the entire process is conducted as promptly as possible and implement the steps necessary to complete each stage of the procedure within an appropriate time frame.

After examining the facts of the case and hearing the statement of the person concerned, the ombudspersons make a decision as to whether the previous findings invalidate or strengthen the suspicion of misconduct. If the suspicion is confirmed and a solution to the conflict cannot be found, the ombudspersons instruct an investigative commission. The commission’s review is carried out according to whether there are behaviours and violations that are contrary to good scientific practice as listed in the DFG's Code of Procedure (2019b) under point II and in the Leibniz Association's guideline on good scientific practice under §3 (Leibniz Association 2019a).

In agreement with the IAMO directors and the chairperson of the Scientific Advisory Board, the ombudspersons shall appoint the members and deputy members of a case-specific commission to review scientific misconduct. The commission shall include one scientist from each scientific department and the ombudspersons as guests with an advisory vote. If necessary, external scientists can also be appointed as members of the commission. A deputy shall represent the respective member in the event that they are prejudiced or prevented from attending.

The Commission shall elect a Chairperson and a Deputy Chairperson from among its members. The Chairperson - or in the event of his/her being prevented, the Deputy Chairperson - shall invite to the meetings of the Commission, chair them and implement their resolutions. The Commission shall constitute a quorum if at least two members are present; a connection by telephone or other suitable means of communication shall be ensured. The Commission shall decide by simple majority. Minutes of its meetings shall be taken and shall record the main outcome of the meeting. The Commission may consult other persons in an advisory capacity. The Commission shall organise its work in such a way as to ensure an expeditious procedure.

The Commission takes over the investigation results from the ombudspersons and decides on the

further proceedings. It may discontinue the proceedings, in particular it may do so upon justified request of the informing person, or it may initiate further investigations or submit a basis for decision to the IAMO directorate.

The commission shall not deliberate in public. The persons concerned shall be heard at their request. For this purpose, they may call in a person of their confidence as an advisor. This also applies to other persons to be heard. The commission may inform the persons concerned of the names of the persons providing information. The persons providing the information shall be informed of the disclosure in advance.

If the Commission considers scientific misconduct to be proven, it shall report in writing to the directors of IAMO on the outcome of its investigations and propose the manner in which the proceedings should be continued, also with regard to safeguarding the rights of others. This report shall also be given to the persons concerned and to the informants. The files shall be kept for 10 years. Informants shall be protected from any adverse treatment. Intentional false accusations may be punished under service law.

The directorate shall review recommendations of the investigative commission and decide on the further course of action. The directors inform the investigative commission of their decision. If the person concerned is employed by IAMO, consequences under labour law such as a warning, dismissal or termination of contract may be considered in the case of scientific misconduct. Furthermore, consequences under civil law may be considered, such as the issuing of a ban from the premises, claims for restitution against those affected (for example, with regard to stolen material), claims for removal and injunctive relief under copyright law, personal rights law, patent law and competition law, claims for repayment (for example, of scholarships, third-party funding) or claims for damages by IAMO or third parties in the event of personal injury, damage to property or the like.

In order to enforce academic consequences, the directorate may transfer the proceedings to the respective university. In the event of misconduct relevant under criminal law, the directorate shall file charges. If the suspicion of academic misconduct has been wrongly raised, the directorate shall ensure rehabilitation after consultation with the accused person(s).

If, in the course of an investigation, it becomes apparent that a final clarification of the allegations is not possible within IAMO or that the conduct of the investigation is prevented by exceptional circumstances, the ombudspersons shall submit the case to the central ombudsman board of the Leibniz Association. This does not affect the possibility of turning to the "Ombudsman for Science" committee set up by the DFG.

Bibliography

DFG. 2019a. *Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice: Code of Conduct.* Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG). https://wissenschaftliche-integritaet.de/en/code-of-conduct/ (last

accessed 15 April 2020).
---. 2019b. *Rules of Procedure for Dealing with Scientific Misconduct (VerfOwF)*. Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG). https://www.dfg.de/formulare/80_01/80_01_en.pdf (last accessed 15 September 2020).
---. 2020. Verfahrensleitfaden zur guten wissenschaftlichen Praxis. Bonn: Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG).
Leibniz-Gemeinschaft. 2019a. *Guidelines for Good Scientific Practice in the Leibniz Association*. https://www.leibniz-gemeinschaft.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Bilder_und_Downloads/%C3%9Cber_uns/Integrit%C3%A4t/Guidelines_for_Good_Scientific_Practice_in_the_Leibniz_Association.pdf (last accessed 10. Juni 2020).
---. 2019b. *Leitlinie Karriereentwicklung in der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft - Ergänzung: Ausgestaltung der Promotionsphase*. https://www.leibniz-gemeinschaft.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Bilder_und_Downloads/%C3%9Cber_uns/Karriere/Broschuere-Leibniz-Ausgestaltung-Promotionsphase-2020_WEB.pdf (last accessed 10. Februar 2021).
---. 2021. *Leibniz Code for Good Scientific Practice*. https://www.leibniz-gemeinschaft.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Bilder_und_Downloads/%C3%9Cber_uns/Gute_wissenschaftliche_Praxis/Leibniz_Code_for_Good_Research_Practice.pdf (last accessed 10. Januar 2022).