

Regulations for Safeguarding Good Research Practice at the Georg-Speyer-Haus

Institute for Tumor Biology and Experimental Therapy

Paul-Ehrlich-Str. 42-44

60596 Frankfurt am Main

Disclaimer:

This English translation of the Regulations for Safeguarding Good Research Practice at the Georg-Speyer-Haus is provided for informational purposes. The English text was carefully translated and reviewed for accuracy. In the event that the English and German versions permit different interpretations, the German text shall prevail.

Table of contents

Preamble.....	2
1. Commitment to the general principles.....	3
2. Professional ethics.....	3
3. Organizational responsibility of the institute management.....	4
4. Responsibility of the heads of research work units.....	4
5. Dimensions of performance and assessment criteria.....	5
6. Ombudspersons.....	5
7. Cross-phase quality assurance.....	6
8. Stakeholders, responsibilities and roles.....	7
9. Research design.....	7
10. Legal and ethical frameworks, usage rights.....	7
11. Methods and standards.....	8
12. Documentation.....	8
13. Providing public access to research results.....	9
14. Authorship.....	9
15. Publication medium.....	10
16. Confidentiality and neutrality of review processes and discussions.....	11
17. Archiving.....	11
18. Complainants and respondents.....	12
19. Elements of scientific misconduct.....	13
20. Procedures in cases of alleged scientific misconduct.....	15
Entry into force.....	18



Preamble

Scientific integrity is the foundation of trustworthy science. It is an expression of academic voluntary commitment that encompasses respectful treatment of each other, study participants, animals, data, cultural assets and the environment, and strengthens and promotes society's indispensable trust in science. The constitutionally guaranteed freedom of research (Art. 5 para. 3 GG) is inseparably linked to a corresponding responsibility. It is the duty of all scientists to take this responsibility fully into account and to embed it as a guideline for their own actions. The research community itself ensures good scientific practice through fair and honest attitude and action, as well as through organizational and procedural regulations. Whistleblowers who report a justified suspicion of scientific misconduct fulfill an indispensable function for the self-control of science.

The Georg-Speyer-Haus promotes good scientific practice by a consensus of all scientists and by the definition of research ethical standards, to which our scientists commit themselves and which they establish among themselves. The Georg-Speyer-Haus ombudsperson and the independent body *Ombudsman for Science* (ombudsman-fuer-die-wissenschaft.de) are trustworthy contact persons offering advice and conflict mediation in questions of good scientific practice and its possible violation by scientific misconduct.

The following rules for safeguarding good scientific practice at the Georg-Speyer-Haus are substantially based on the *Code of Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice* of the German Research Foundation (DFG) in its current version. The code summarizes the central standards of good scientific practice and describes the procedure in case of non-compliance. It offers our scientists, who must hold up their integrity in their daily research work, a reliable guideline to anchor good scientific practice as a secure and binding reference in their research. The present regulations serve to implement the Code. They are to be applied by all persons who are active in research or research support in the context of the Georg-Speyer-Haus.

The Georg-Speyer-Haus will apply the procedure described in the following text in the event of suspicions of possible scientific misconduct. At every stage of this procedure, attention must be paid to the compliance with and requirements of legal rules and regulations (especially in labor and criminal law).

1. Commitment to the general principles

Good scientific practice means working *lege artis* and always following the latest state of knowledge. It requires knowledge and utilization of current literature and the application of the latest methods and findings. It is characterized by doubt and self-criticism, by critical examination of the findings obtained and their control, for example by mutual review within the working groups, but also by honesty towards the contributions of colleagues, co-workers, competitors and predecessors. Careful quality assurance is an important characteristic of scientific integrity. Along with honesty towards oneself and others as an ethical norm, it is the basis for scientific professionalism. It is ensured by cooperation and critical exchange in scientific working groups and by clear responsibility structures.

This includes:

- Regulated, not necessarily hierarchical, organizational structures
- Delegation of tasks or functional division of responsibility
- Awareness of all about their rights and duties
- Clear and unambiguous communication and transparency
- Regulated supervision and accountability
- Effective supervision of young scientists
- Avoiding, recognizing and resolving conflicts
- Regular training/continuing professional education in all areas and at all organizational levels

The present regulations for ensuring Good Scientific Practice at the Georg-Speyer-Haus will be announced to the employees by e-mail and personal handout when they come into force and will be deposited on the homepage of the Georg-Speyer-Haus (www.georg-speyer-haus.de/GWP). The regulations are also posted in written form on the "white board" and are an integral part of the hiring documents for new employees.

2. Professional ethics

All scientists at Georg-Speyer-Haus at any career level are responsible for ensuring that their own conduct meets the standards of good scientific practice. They actively acquire the necessary knowledge at the earliest possible stage of their scientific career and regularly update their knowledge of these standards and the state of research. In doing so, they support each other in the continuous learning and further education process and maintain regular exchange with each other. For this purpose, too, a well-established institute seminar is held every



two weeks, in which scientists present their latest results to the entire institute. The data presented are discussed together, critically scrutinized, controls are evaluated, and suggestions are made.

3. Organizational responsibility of the institute management

The management of the Georg-Speyer-Haus creates the framework for scientific work by means of an appropriate institutional organizational structure and is responsible for the communication of and compliance with good scientific practice as well as for appropriate career support for all scientists. It guarantees the conditions for scientists to comply with legal and ethical standards. The framework also includes clear and written procedures. Quality assurance and conflict resolution are clearly assigned and appropriately communicated, e.g., through appropriate instructions in the introductory handout upon hiring.

Georg-Speyer-Haus has signed the "Diversity Charter" and follows its principles in its everyday work. In the context of personnel selection and development, the equality of all genders and diversity are taken into account. The corresponding processes at Georg-Speyer-Haus are transparent and avoid, as far as possible, unconscious bias. The contact details of the contact person for equality and diversity are known to the employees.

Established support structures and concepts are constantly being developed for our scientists. Sincere advice for career and further career paths as well as further educational opportunities and appropriate mentoring for scientific and science-accessory staff are offered. Participation in GSP courses is expected of group leaders and postdoctoral fellows. Leadership training is provided for all staff with personnel responsibilities.

4. Responsibility of the heads of research work units

The management of a scientific working unit (e.g., working group or "core facility") bears responsibility for the entire unit. It ensures that the working unit as a whole can fulfill its tasks, that the necessary cooperation and coordination take place, and that all members are aware of their roles, rights and duties. This includes, in particular, ensuring appropriate individual supervision of junior scientists and career advancement of both scientific and science-support personnel. We prevent the abuse of power and the exploitation of dependencies through appropriate organizational measures both at the level of the individual scientific work unit and at the management level. In detail, this includes the following requirements:



- Participation of doctoral researchers in graduate schools / courses (such as Frankfurt GRADE: Goethe Research Academy for Early Career Researchers).
- All new doctoral researchers are admitted to the Paul Ehrlich Graduate School (PEGS) at the Georg-Speyer-Haus and follow its curriculum.
- For each doctoral researcher, a separate supervisory group ("Thesis Advisory Committee" TAC) consisting of the supervisor and two additional group leaders, one of whom should be external, is established. In addition, a corresponding supervision agreement is documented in writing. The TAC meets at least once a year, monitors and evaluates the progress of the work and is available to the doctoral candidate for consultation. In particular, extensions of the time required to complete dissertations that cannot be objectively justified should be avoided.

Independently of TAC meetings, an additional meeting with the respective employee should be held once a year to discuss the further development of the doctoral researchers.

5. Dimensions of performance and assessment criteria

For the evaluation of the performance of our scientists, the Georg-Speyer-Haus has a multidimensional approach. In addition to scientific performance such as knowledge gain and critical reflection, other aspects are considered. The evaluation of the performance primarily follows qualitative standards, whereby quantitative indicators can only be included in the overall evaluation in a differentiated and reflected manner. Where voluntarily indicated, individual characteristics in CVs are also included in the judgment in addition to the categories of the General Equal Treatment Act.

6. Ombudspersons

The Georg-Speyer-Haus has an independent ombudsperson as a neutral and qualified contact person to whom our scientists can turn at any time in questions of good scientific practice and in questions of suspected scientific misconduct. The ombudsperson shall have the personal integrity and factual judgment necessary to fulfill her/his duties, shall receive inquiries with due regard for confidentiality, and shall forward suspected cases of scientific misconduct to the responsible investigative commission if necessary. This ombudsperson may not be a member of the institute's management or the investigating commission during his or her term of office and should, if possible, work outside the institute. The ombudsperson shall treat all inquiries neutrally and strictly confidentially as



a matter of principle, i.e., in compliance with confidentiality, and shall contribute to solution-oriented conflict mediation to the extent possible.

Our respective responsible ombudsperson as well as the deputy (in case of concern of bias or prevention) are announced at the Georg-Speyer-Haus. Their contact details can also be found on our website: georg-speyer-haus.de/ombudsperson. The term of office is limited to four years and can be extended once for another four years. Ombudspersons and their deputies receive the necessary content-related support and acceptance from the management of Georg-Speyer-Haus in the performance of their duties.

Alternatively, employees can contact the national body "Ombudsman for Science": ombudsman-fuer-die-wissenschaft.de.

7. Cross-phase quality assurance

The scientists perform each step of the research process in a *lege artis* manner. When scientific findings are made publicly available (in the narrower sense in the form of publications, but also in the broader sense via other communication channels), the applied mechanisms of quality assurance of the Georg-Speyer-Haus are always outlined. This applies in particular when new methods are developed.

If discrepancies or errors are discovered afterwards, they will be corrected. If the discrepancies or errors are the reason for the retraction of a publication, the scientists will work with the relevant publishers or infrastructure providers as quickly as possible to ensure that the correction or retraction is made and marked accordingly. The same applies if the scientists are informed of such discrepancies or errors by third parties.

Essential components of quality assurance are the exact documentation of the data, organisms, materials, and software used in the research process and their origin and subsequent use, so that results or findings can be replicated or confirmed by other scientists (for example, by means of a detailed description of materials and methods; cf. guideline 12).

8. Stakeholders, responsibilities and roles

The roles and responsibilities of the scientists involved in a research project, as well as those of the research support personnel, are clearly defined at Georg-Speyer-Haus at all times during a research project. Participants are in regular exchange, define their roles and responsibilities in an appropriate manner and adjust them if necessary. Rights and obligations arising from cooperation with commercial partners are contractually regulated in advance.

9. Research design

When planning a project, scientists take the current state of research fully into account and acknowledge it. The identification of relevant and suitable research questions requires a careful search for research achievements that have already been made publicly available. The Georg-Speyer-Haus ensures the necessary framework conditions for this. When planning projects, there must be transparency about the commercial or other interests of those involved, and conflicts of interest must be avoided.

In particular, the following aspects are considered:

- Relevance of gender and diversity, for example when it comes to the transferability of results and their subsequent application to different groups of people (cf. e.g. corresponding [checklist of diversity dimensions of the DFG](#)).
- Methods to avoid (unconscious) bias.
- 3R principles in research work with preclinical models (see the [DFG's handout The 3R principle and the validity of scientific research](#)).

10. Legal and ethical frameworks, usage rights

Scientists at Georg-Speyer-Haus handle the constitutionally granted freedom of research responsibly and are continuously aware of the danger of misuse of research results by using their knowledge, experience, and skills to identify, assess and evaluate risks. They take into account rights and obligations, especially those resulting from legal requirements but also from contracts with third parties and obtain and submit approvals and ethics votes when necessary. A thorough assessment and evaluation of the research consequences, also regarding safety-relevant ("dual use") and ethical aspects, are carried out. The results of the scientific work are not the property of the individual scientist. They

belong to the institution in which they were collected.

The legal framework of a research project also includes documented agreements on the rights of use or access of third parties to research data and results arising from it, taking into account data protection regulations. In particular, the researcher who collected the data is entitled to use them. In this context, attention must also be paid to any applicable fair and equitable participation of the countries of origin of genetic resources in the benefits arising from their use in accordance with the Nagoya Protocol ("access and benefit sharing").

11. Methods and standards

To answer research questions, scientists at Georg-Speyer-Haus apply scientifically sound and appropriate methods. When developing and applying new methods, they attach particular importance to quality assurance and the establishment of standards such as application software, research data collection, and the description of their research results including the associated metadata.

12. Documentation

At the Georg-Speyer-Haus, scientists document all information relevant to the development of a research result as comprehensibly as is necessary and appropriate for their field in order to be able to check and evaluate the result. In general, they therefore also document individual results that do not support the research hypothesis. A selection of results must be avoided in this context. If concrete subject-specific recommendations exist for the review and assessment, researchers create documentation according to the respective guidelines. Here we explicitly refer to the "Reporting guidelines for main study types" of the EQUATOR-Network (equator-network.org), the ARRIVE Guidelines (arriveguidelines.org) and the [DFG statement on "Replicability of results in medicine and biomedicine"](#). When developing research software, the source code must be persistent, citable, and fully documented. If the documentation does not meet the relevant requirements, the limitations, and the reasons for them are clearly explained. Documentation and research results are protected against manipulation in the best possible way.



13. Providing public access to research results

Our scientists contribute all results to the scientific discourse. In specific cases, however, there may be reasons not to make results publicly available (in the narrower sense in the form of publications, but also in the broader sense via other communication channels). This decision must not depend on third parties.

Scientists at the Georg-Speyer-Haus decide autonomously – with due regard for the conventions of the relevant subject area – whether, how and where they make their results publicly available. In particular, the general conditions mentioned under point 10 are taken into consideration. Once the decision has been made to make results publicly available, our scientists describe them completely and comprehensibly. This also includes, as far as possible and reasonable, making the research data, materials and information on which the results are based, the methods applied and the software used available in recognized archives and repositories (e.g. biobanks). Further examples of repositories can be found at <https://zenodo.org>, <https://risources.dfg.de> or <https://www.re3data.org>. In this context, the workflows must be presented in full accordance with the FAIR principles (**F**indable, **A**ccessible, **I**nteroperable, **R**eusable; see also <https://www.go-fair.org/fair-principles>). Only in the case of own results that have already been made publicly available, there may be an exception to the citation requirement. Furthermore, inappropriately small publications are to be avoided and self-citations are to be limited to the necessary minimum.

Restrictions may apply to public availability in the case of patent applications. If research software developed in-house is to be made available to third parties, it will be provided with an appropriate license. Scientists must provide complete and correct evidence of their own and others' preliminary work.

14. Authorship

An author is someone who has made a genuine, identifiable contribution to the content of a scientific text, data or software publication. Such a contribution exists in particular if scientists have contributed in a scientifically relevant way to one or more of the following points:

- Development and conception of the research project
- Development, collection, acquisition or provision of data, software or sources
- Analyzing, evaluating, or interpreting data and sources and drawing conclusions from them.
- Writing the manuscript



If a contribution is not sufficient to justify authorship, such support may be appropriately acknowledged in footnotes, a foreword, or an acknowledgement. Honorary authorship in which no such contribution has been made is not permissible. A leadership or supervisory role does not in itself constitute co-authorship.

In principle, the respective contribution of a person should be adequately reflected in the authorship. The scientists therefore agree on the order of authors in good time (at the latest when the manuscript is being drafted) and on the basis of clear criteria.

All authors must agree to the final version of the work to be published. They are jointly responsible for the publication, as long as this is not explicitly stated otherwise. Researchers may not refuse to give their consent to publication of the results without sufficient grounds. The refusal of consent must be justified with a verifiable criticism of data, methods or results.

Our authors take care and, as far as possible, seek to ensure that their research contributions are identified by the publishers or infrastructure providers in such a way that they can be correctly cited by users.

15. Publication medium

The authors at the Georg-Speyer-Haus carefully select the publication medium, taking into account the quality and visibility in the respective field of discourse. Academic repositories, data and software repositories as well as blogs can be considered alongside books and journals. An open, but at the same time responsible use of new media is expected.

A new or unknown publication medium is evaluated to assess its seriousness. The [Directory of Open Access Journals \(DOAJ\)](#), for example, which lists scientific journals with quality control, plays an important role here. In general, publication in open access media is preferable. The Georg-Speyer-Haus has joined the Germany-wide DEAL consortium.

In addition, our scientists with the function of editorship carefully consider for which publication medium they take on this task.

The scientific quality of a contribution does not depend on the publication medium in which it is made publicly available.

16. Confidentiality and neutrality of review processes and discussions

Honest conduct is the basis of the legitimacy of a judgment-forming process. Scientists at the Georg-Speyer-Haus, who evaluate submitted manuscripts, funding proposals or personal qualifications, are bound to strict confidentiality in this respect. They disclose all facts that could give rise to concerns of conflict of interest. This confidentiality expressly includes a prohibition on the disclosure of the information to third parties and on making personal use of it.

The obligation to maintain confidentiality and to disclose facts that may give rise to concerns of conflict of interest also applies to members of scientific advisory and decision-making bodies.

Our scientists immediately report any conflicts of interest or bias that could be justified with regard to the research project being reviewed or the person or subject of the discussion to the responsible office.

17. Archiving

Scientists shall adequately back up publicly accessible research data or research results as well as the underlying central materials and, if applicable, the research software used, and shall retain them for an appropriate period of time. For example, all steps and results of an experiment or study, including the associated metadata, must be documented completely and correctly, and protocols and research data must be stored securely. Experimental protocols should record the experimental objective, the experimental conditions, the experimental procedure and the experimental result in a comprehensible manner and in a form that cannot be changed afterwards (cf. Landesinitiative Hessische Forschungsdateninfrastrukturen: <https://www.uni-marburg.de/de/hefdi>.) The legal framework conditions for research data management, including aspects of use and copyright law and ownership issues, are taken into account.

The archiving period begins on the date public access is established. As a rule, the archiving period for accessibility and traceability is ten years at the Georg-Speyer-Haus or in cross-location repositories, where they originated. In justified cases, shorter archiving periods or no retention at all may be appropriate. The respective reasons for this are comprehensibly described by the scientists. For genetic engineering work, the documents must be retained for ten (Sicherheitsstufe 1) or 30 years (Sicherheitsstufe 2) after completion of the work.



In this context, the Georg-Speyer-Haus ensures that the infrastructure required for archiving (including access and usage management) is in place and maintains sufficient storage capacity to prevent the loss or even accidental deletion of data.

The respective project manager is responsible for archiving. When they leave the institute, the IT department takes over the curation of the data.

18. Complainants and respondents

The investigation of allegations of scientific misconduct is carried out expressly in compliance with confidentiality and the basic principle of the presumption of innocence. If complainants (whistleblowers) are not able to check the facts themselves or if there are uncertainties in the interpretation of the guidelines for good scientific practice with regard to an observed event, the whistleblowers contact the Ombudsperson of the Georg-Speyer-Haus or the *Ombudsman for Science* committee to clarify the suspicion (see guideline 6).

Ombudspersons and investigative commissions that examine a suspicion of scientific misconduct are committed to protecting both the whistleblowers and the respondents (the persons affected by the allegations) in an appropriate manner. Their conduct is based on the fundamental principle of the presumption of innocence vis-à-vis the persons concerned at every stage of the proceedings within the framework of a case-by-case consideration. As a matter of principle, those affected by the allegations should not suffer any disadvantages from the review of the suspicion until scientific misconduct has been formally established.

The whistleblower's report must be made in good faith. Deliberately false or malicious allegations may themselves constitute scientific misconduct.

A report made anonymously can only be reviewed in a procedure if the person making the report provides the body investigating the suspicion with reliable and sufficiently concrete facts. Neither the complainants nor the respondents should suffer any disadvantages for his or her own scientific or professional advancement as a result of the report. The report should not lead to delays in the qualification of the whistleblower, especially in the case of young scientists, and the preparation of theses and doctoral dissertations should not be disadvantaged. This also applies to working conditions and possible contract extensions.

If the names of the whistleblowers are known, the investigating body shall treat the names confidentially and shall not disclose them to third parties without appropriate consent. Different requirements apply only if there is a legal obligation to do so or the persons affected by the allegations cannot otherwise defend themselves properly because, as an exception, the case concerns the identity of the complainant. Before their names are disclosed, they will be

informed immediately and the whistleblowers will decide whether they wish to withdraw the report if the names are likely to be disclosed.

The confidentiality of the procedure is restricted if the whistleblower makes the suspicion public. The investigating body decides on a case-by-case basis how to deal with breaches of confidentiality by whistleblowers. Whistleblowers are to be protected even in the case of unproven scientific misconduct, unless it can be proven that the reporting of the allegations was made against better knowledge. In this context, reference is made to the EU Whistleblower Directive (EU 2019/1937), the requirements of which are implemented and lived in the Georg-Speyer-Haus.

If the complainant withdraws the report, the question arises as to whether the respective body must nevertheless continue to investigate the reported possible suspicion. If the reported allegation has been sufficiently presented and explained, and if the suspicion of scientific misconduct is substantiated, the ombudsperson/investigation commission should continue the proceedings. In individual cases, the decisive factor should also be which reported concern, which suspicion is specifically at issue, and whether the continuation of the investigation of the suspicion without the whistleblower can lead to a meaningful result. In the case of conflicts concerning the supervision of young scientists, further investigation without the involvement of a complainant will be more difficult than, for example, in the case of a review of plagiarism.

19. Elements of scientific misconduct

Not every breach of the good scientific practice constitutes scientific misconduct. The definitions of the elements of scientific misconduct are set out in Section II of the DFG's Rules of Procedure for Dealing with Scientific Misconduct (VerfOWF), in the amended valid version (https://www.dfg.de/formulare/80_01).

The following intentional or grossly negligent violations can be considered as scientific misconduct, although it should be noted that other offenses are also possible.

- (1)** Scientific misconduct occurs if a person working scientifically at the Georg-Speyer-Haus intentionally or grossly negligently makes false statements in a scientific context, appropriates other people's scientific achievements without authorization or impairs the research activities of others. The special circumstances according to points (5) to (8) remain unaffected.

(2) False data are:

- a) fabricating scientifically relevant data or research results,
- b) falsifying data or research results relevant to science, in particular by suppressing or eliminating data or results obtained in the research process without disclosing it, or by manipulating a representation or illustration,
- c) the incongruent representation of an image and the corresponding statement,
- d) incorrect science-related information provided in a grant application or as part of the reporting requirement
- e) claiming authorship or co-authorship of another person without that person's consent.

(3) The following cases constitute inadmissible attribution of third-party scientific achievements:

- a) Unmarked adoption of third-party content without the required citation ("plagiarism"),
- b) unauthorized use of research approaches, research results and scientific ideas ("theft of ideas"),
- c) unauthorized disclosure of scientific data, theories and findings to third parties,
- d) claiming or unfounded assumption of authorship or co-authorship of a scientific publication, especially if no genuine, traceable contribution to the scientific content of the publication has been made,
- e) falsification of the scientific content,
- f) unauthorized publication and unauthorized making available to third parties as long as the scientific work, finding, hypothesis, teaching or research approach has not been published.

(4) Interference with the research activities of others is particularly present in the following cases:

- a) Sabotage of research activities (including damaging, destroying, or tampering with experimental setups, equipment, records, hardware, software, chemicals, or other items needed by others for research purposes),
- b) Falsification or unauthorized disposal of research data or documentation of research data.

(5) Scientific misconduct by persons working scientifically at the Georg-Speyer-Haus also results - in the case of intent or gross negligence - from

- a) co-authorship of a publication that contains false statements or inadmissibly appropriated third-party scientific achievements,
- b) the neglect of supervisory duties, if another person has objectively committed the act of scientific misconduct as defined in items (1) to (4) and this would have been prevented or made substantially more difficult by the necessary and reasonable supervision.

(6) Scientific misconduct also results from the intentional participation (in



the sense of instigation or aiding and abetting) in the intentional misconduct of others as defined under these regulations.

- (7)** Scientific misconduct on the part of persons providing expert opinions or committee members of the Georg-Speyer-Haus shall be deemed to have occurred if they intentionally or through gross negligence
- a) make unauthorized use for their own scientific purposes of scientific data, theories or findings of which they have become aware in the course of their work as an expert or panel member,
 - b) in the course of their activities as persons providing expert opinions or committee members, disclose data, theories or findings to third parties without authorization, in violation of the confidentiality of the proceedings,
 - c) in the course of his or her activities as an expert or committee member, does not disclose to the competent body facts or circumstances that may give rise to a conflict of interest.
- (8)** Scientific misconduct shall also be deemed to have occurred if a person providing an expert opinion or a member of a committee of the Georg-Speyer-Haus, in the course of his/her activities, with the intention of obtaining an advantage for himself/herself or another person, against his/her better knowledge, fails to disclose facts from which scientific misconduct on the part of the other person within the meaning of points (1) to (5) can be inferred.

20. Procedures in cases of alleged scientific misconduct

The procedure for dealing with allegations of scientific misconduct at the Georg- Speyer-Haus is based on the [DFG's Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice](#).

- (1)** Whistleblowers should contact the ombudsperson or his/her deputy with a suspicious activity report in accordance with Guideline 6. A report of suspicion should be made in text form. If the report is made verbally, a transcript must be prepared by the receiving body.
- (2)** The facts on which the expressed suspicion is based should be determined. The exact determination of what happened should be made without delay. The period for this should not exceed two weeks. If the ombudsperson concludes that sufficiently concrete suspicions exist, he/she shall initiate a preliminary investigation. The investigation must be conducted with strict regard for confidentiality and the protection of all persons providing information and those accused. Within the framework of the preliminary examination, the ombudsperson may conduct the investigations



necessary to clarify the facts of the case, insofar as these are permissible by virtue of higher-ranking law. For example, the ombudsperson may request, obtain and view documents, obtain and secure other evidence, obtain statements or - if necessary - obtain external expert opinions. All persons involved must be requested to treat the inquiry confidentially.

(3) As part of the preliminary examination, the ombudsperson shall immediately (no later than two weeks after the suspicion becomes known) request the accused person in writing to comment on the allegation. In doing so, he/she shall list the incriminating facts and evidence against the accused person. A deadline must be set for the statement (usually four weeks). The deadline may be extended. The statement shall be made in writing or in text form. Accused persons are not obliged to incriminate themselves. The name of the whistleblower will not be disclosed to the accused without his/her consent.

(4) After receipt of the statement of the person concerned or after expiry of the deadline, the ombudsperson shall make a decision, if possible, within a period of one week, as to whether the previous findings have invalidated the suspicion of misconduct or whether the suspicion has become stronger and further investigations are therefore necessary.

If there is no sufficient suspicion of prosecutable scientific misconduct, the ombudsperson shall discontinue the proceedings. After being informed of the essential reasons that led to the decision, the whistleblower is granted the right to remonstrate against the decision within a two-week period. If the remonstration period has expired fruitlessly or if remonstration has not led to a different decision, the discontinuation decision shall be communicated to the accused person in writing, stating the essential reasons for the decision.

If there is sufficient suspicion of a scientific misconduct, the ombudsperson will transfer the preliminary examination to a formal investigation, which will be conducted by the investigative commission. The ombudsperson shall notify the whistleblower and the accused of this decision in writing. If the accused person has denied the allegation, a brief outline of why the allegation could not be refuted should be provided. At this point, the ombudsperson informs the scientific management of the institute of the matter.

(5) The five-member investigating commission is appointed by the Institute's management (in case of conflict of interest by the Scientific Advisory Board) and usually consists of four scientific members and one representative with legal expertise (fully qualified lawyer) to be appointed by the Executive Board. The guidelines on questions of conflict of interest based on the regulations of the DFG (https://www.dfg.de/formulare/10_201) apply. If necessary, substitutes can be nominated (e.g. in case of absence of a commission member).



- (6) The investigating commission is bound by the standards of good scientific practice and the definitions of scientific misconduct laid down in these regulations. In addition, the commission shall take into account the recognized professional standards and shall base its work on the customary principles of establishing the truth. The investigating commission deliberates in non-public and oral proceedings. In consultation with the scientific management, it initiates further investigations and examines in free assessment of evidence whether scientific misconduct has occurred. Until scientific misconduct has been proven, all parties involved undertake to treat the documents of the commission and the findings of the proceedings confidentially. The initiated investigations and procedural steps, the ascertained facts, findings and results are to be disclosed only to the whistleblowers and the accused. They may inspect all documents and request information at any time. Furthermore, they shall be given the opportunity to comment at every stage of the proceedings and they may call in a person of their confidence as an advisor. The hearing of other persons is permissible. As a rule, the review shall be completed within a period of no more than four months from the constituent meeting of the investigative commission. A clear time frame shall be set depending on the seriousness of the allegation. The individual stages of the procedure are to be recorded and documented in writing and in a manner that is easy to follow.
- (7) If the investigating commission considers misconduct to be unproven, it shall cease its activities and inform the parties involved by means of a written report.
- (8) If the investigating commission considers misconduct to be proven, it shall promptly present the results of its investigations in a final investigation report to the Institute's management respectively the chairperson of the Scientific Advisory Board. The findings of the investigative commission are not legally binding. The consultation of legal counsel is strongly recommended. The Institute Management of the Georg- Speyer-Haus or the competent committee in case of conflict of interest will decide on the initiation of possible disciplinary, labor, civil or criminal law consequences.
- (9) If the withdrawal of an academic degree is considered as a measure following the discovery of academic misconduct, the responsible bodies (e.g. the awarding university) shall be involved.
- (10) Scientific publications that are erroneous due to scientific misconduct that has been proven beyond doubt must be withdrawn if they are still unpublished and corrected if they have been published (revocation); cooperation partners must be informed in an appropriate form if necessary. In principle, the authors and editors involved are obligated to do so; if they do not take action, the Institute's management will initiate the appropriate measures available to it.

- (11)** In cases of serious scientific misconduct, the Institute's management shall inform other research institutions or scientific organizations concerned. In justified cases, it may also be appropriate to inform professional organizations.
- (12)** The Institute's management may be obliged to inform affected third parties and the public in order to protect third parties, to maintain confidence in scientific honesty, to restore its scientific reputation, to prevent consequential damage, and in the general public interest.
- (13)** An offense can be prosecuted even if the accused person is no longer working scientifically at the Georg-Speyer-Haus in the meantime, but was working scientifically there at the time of the offense.

Entry into force

These regulations come into force on 09.05.2023 and replace the regulations of 11 February 2003.

Frankfurt am Main, 09.05.2023

Directorate, represented by the Director Prof. Dr. Florian R. Greten