Statutes of the Frankfurt Institute for Advanced Studies to ensure good scientific practice

Adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Frankfurt Institute for Advanced Studies on 16 November 2023 to implement the "Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice" (Codex) of the German Research Foundation.[1]

Preamble

Observance of and compliance with the rules of good scientific practice are elementary prerequisites for scientific work and for recognition in the scientific community as well as for the recognition of scientific work in public. They are a central element of the Frankfurt Institute for Advanced Studies (FIAS) researchers' self-image of quality.

The rules of good scientific practice include, in particular, working lege artis, maintaining strict honesty with regard to one's own contributions and those of third parties, consistently reflecting critically on all results and allowing and promoting a discourse in the scientific community based on criteria of scientific rigour and truth.

Any violation of these rules is incompatible with the nature of science and jeopardises the trust of scientists among themselves as well as the trust of the public in science. Accordingly, the following regulations of these statutes are binding for all scientists working at FIAS. Every scientist is responsible for ensuring that their own behaviour complies with the standards of good scientific practice set out in these statutes. The rules formulated below cannot prevent isolated instances of dishonest behaviour. However, they are intended and suitable for creating an awareness of good scientific practice and thus contribute to limiting scientific misconduct.

A. Institutional guidelines for safeguarding good scientific practice at FIAS

1. Organisational responsibility of the Executive Board

a. In addition to measures to identify and punish scientific misconduct, appropriate measures should be taken or reinforced to prevent scientific misconduct from occurring. FIAS, as a centre for research, teaching and the promotion of academic career development, has institutional responsibility in this regard.

b. The FIAS Board of Directors creates the framework conditions for scientific work. The framework conditions include clear procedures and principles for personnel selection and development as well as the promotion of early career researchers and equal opportunities. The obligation to comply with the rules of good scientific practice is part of every appointment and retention negotiation as well as the employment and scholarship contracts at FIAS. The regulations are announced to all scientists and made available at https://fias.institute.de/office/gute-wissenschaftliche-praxis

[1] These statutes are based on the corresponding "Statutes of the Johann Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt am Main to ensure good scientific practice" in the version dated 7 March 2023.

Gender equality and diversity are taken into account in personnel selection and development. The relevant processes are transparent and avoid unconscious bias as far as possible. They also use suitable organisational measures to prevent abuse of power and the exploitation of relationships of dependency at FIAS management level.

c. In addition to measures to identify and punish scientific misconduct, suitable measures should be taken or reinforced to prevent scientific misconduct. FIAS, as a centre for research, teaching and the promotion of academic career development, has institutional responsibility in this regard.

d. The Board of Directors is responsible for the framework conditions for compliance with and communication of good scientific practice as well as appropriate career support for all scientists. The Board of Directors creates the necessary conditions for scientists to be able to comply with legal and ethical standards.

e. The institutional organisational structure of FIAS ensures that, depending on the size of the individual scientific work units, the tasks of management, supervision, quality assurance and conflict resolution are clearly assigned and appropriately communicated to the respective members and affiliates.

f. Suitable support structures and concepts have been established for researchers in the early career phase and are being further developed as required. Comprehensive and transparent counselling for careers and other career paths as well as further training opportunities and mentoring for academic and academic support staff are offered.

2. Responsibility of the management of work units

a. The management of scientific work units is responsible for the entire unit, in particular for an appropriate organisation that ensures that the tasks and roles of management, scientific monitoring and competence transfer, supervision, conflict regulation and quality assurance are clearly assigned so that they can actually be performed appropriately and the group as a whole can fulfil its tasks.

b. Academics and academic support staff enjoy a balance of support and personal responsibility appropriate to their career level. They are accorded adequate status with corresponding participation rights.

c. The head of an academic unit is responsible for ensuring that appropriate individual supervision - embedded in the overall concept of the unit - is provided for graduates, doctoral candidates and students as well as for academic support staff. There must be a reference person in the organisational unit for each of them who also communicates the FIAS rules for safeguarding good scientific practice. Abuse of power and the exploitation of dependency relationships is counteracted by suitable organisational measures at the level of the individual academic unit.

d. The head of an academic research unit must behave in an exemplary academic manner. Students and early career researchers must be vigilant against possible misconduct in their environment in the interest of their own future planning.

e. The departments are requested to address "scientific misconduct" appropriately and to inform students and scientists in the early career phase about the rules applicable at FIAS to ensure good scientific practice.

3. Performance dimensions and evaluation criteria

a. Originality and quality take precedence over quantity as performance and assessment criteria for examinations, the awarding of academic prizes, appointments, recruitment, promotions and the allocation of funds. FIAS is also guided by this principle when organising evaluation procedures.

b. In addition to scientific performance, other performance dimensions should also be taken into account in the assessment, such as commitment to teaching, academic life at FIAS, public relations work or

knowledge and technology transfer. Contributions in the interest of society as a whole can also be recognised. The researcher's openness to knowledge and willingness to take risks are also considered.

Personal, family or health-related absences or extended training or qualification periods, alternative career paths or comparable circumstances will be incorporated appropriately. Where voluntarily stated, individual characteristics in CVs are also included in the judgement, in addition to the categories of the General Equal Treatment Act.

B. Basic rules of scientific work

1. The guiding principles of scientific work

In addition to compliance with legal regulations at national, European and international level, the following rules in particular apply as general principles of scientific work at FIAS:

a. General rules for scientific practice:

- discipline-specific rules for the collection, selection, processing and documentation of data must be strictly observed;
- primary data, including data that do not support the research results, must be reliably secured and stored for ten years; the procedures used (e.g. laboratory notebook), methodological, evaluation and analysis steps, citations and all important results must be clearly and comprehensibly documented (cf. also Section B.10.).;
- the rule of systematic scepticism must be observed: This means openness to critical doubts about one's own research results or the research results of one's own group. Accordingly, the research process is orientated towards the quality criteria of reliability, validity and objectivity;
- tacit axiomatic assumptions must be made explicit; own interests or morally motivated wishful thinking should be controlled; systematic attention to possible misinterpretations as a result of the methodologically limited comprehensibility of the research object should be maintained (overgeneralisation).

b. General rules of collegiality and cooperation:

- other scientists should not be hindered in their scientific work;
- the scientific qualification of scientists in the early professional phase should be promoted.

c. General rules for the publication of results:

- as a matter of principle, research results should be published in a scientifically appropriate manner in accordance with international disciplinary standards (principle of public access to research);
- research results obtained with public funds should be made freely available wherever possible;
- published errors should be corrected in an appropriate manner;
- the literature used should be analysed and named fairly;
- contributions from employees should be recognised in accordance with the principles of honesty.

d. General rules for proper assessments:

- honest behaviour is the basis of the legitimacy of a judgement-forming process. The scientific contributions of colleagues should be reviewed carefully, selfless and impartially;
- strict confidentiality must be maintained; the disclosure of external content to which reviewers or committee members have access to third parties as well as their own use of this content is prohibited;
- assessments should not be delayed;
- expert opinions may not be prepared as a favour;
- all facts that could give rise to bias must be disclosed;
- the aforementioned obligations also apply to members of scientific advisory and decision-making bodies.

e. Observance of special internal rules of FIAS:

If special rules and guiding principles of scientific work exist in the fields of work, these are to be used as a supplement.

2. Scientific professional ethics

a. Scientists realise the fundamental values and standards of scientific work in their actions and stand up for them. Teaching the fundamentals of good scientific work should begin as early as possible in academic teaching and scientific training. Scientists at all career levels should regularly update their knowledge of the standards of good scientific practice and the state of research.

b. Experienced scientists and scientists in the early professional phase should support each other in the continuous learning and further training process and engage in regular dialogue.

3. Research design

a. Researchers should take the current state of research into account when planning a project. The identification of relevant and suitable research questions requires careful enquiry into research work that has already been made publicly available.

b. Methods to avoid (unconscious) bias in the interpretation of findings, for example blinding of test series, should be applied as far as possible. Researchers should examine whether and, if so, to what extent gender and diversity can be significant for the research project (with regard to the methods, the work programme, the objectives, etc.). The respective framework conditions should be taken into account when interpreting findings.

4. Methods and standards

a. Scientists should use scientifically sound and comprehensible methods to answer research questions. If necessary, the specific competences required for the application of a method are covered, if necessary through correspondingly close cooperation.

b. When developing and applying new methods, scientists should attach particular importance to quality assurance and the establishment of standards.

5. Actors, responsibilities and roles

a. The roles and responsibilities of the scientists involved in a research project, as well as those of the scientific support staff, must be clear at all times during a research project.

b. The participants in a research project should be in regular dialogue. They should define their roles and responsibilities in an appropriate manner and adapt them if necessary. An adjustment is particularly appropriate if the work focus of a participant in the research project changes.

6. Cross-phase quality assurance

a. The scientists should carry out each step in the research process in a lege artis manner and ensure continuous quality assurance during the research process. This applies in particular with regard to

- compliance with specialised standards and established methods,
- processes such as the calibration of devices,
- the collection, documentation, processing and analysis of research data,
- the selection and use of research software as well as its development and programming
- keeping laboratory books.

b. When scientific findings are made publicly available, the quality assurance mechanisms used should always be explained. This applies in particular when new methods are developed.

c. In the event that discrepancies or errors are discovered following a publication, these must be corrected. If the discrepancies or errors give rise to the retraction of a publication, the researchers should work with the relevant publisher or infrastructure provider etc. as quickly as possible to ensure that the correction or retraction is made and labelled accordingly.

d. The origin of data, organisms, materials and software used in the research process should be identified and the subsequent use documented; the original sources are cited. The type and scope of research data generated in the research process are described. The handling of such data should be organised in accordance with the requirements of the subject concerned. The source code of publicly accessible software must be persistent, citable and documented.

e. The fact that results and findings can be replicated or confirmed by other scientists is an essential part of quality assurance, depending on the subject areas concerned.

7. Scientific publications

a. In principle, scientists should include all results in the scientific discourse. In individual cases, however, there may be reasons to refrain from making the results publicly accessible (in the narrower sense in the form of publications, but also in the broader sense via other communication channels); the decision must not depend on third parties. Researchers are responsible for deciding whether, how and where to make their results publicly accessible, considering the practices of the relevant subject area. Inappropriately small publications shall be avoided.

b. Publications are the most important medium for communicating research results to the scientific and general public. In this way, authors publish results for whose scientific reliability they assume responsibility. This includes the complete and comprehensible description of the results obtained and the methods used, as well as the complete and correct proof of their own and others' preliminary work. This also includes, as far as possible and reasonable, making the research data, materials and information on which the results are based, the methods used and the software employed available in recognised archives and repositories in accordance with the FAIR principles ("Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reuseable") and comprehensively describing work processes.

Self-programmed software should be made publicly available with the source code and provided with an appropriate licence.

c. As a rule, previously published results should only be repeated to the extent that this appears necessary for an understanding of the context. Findings that support or call into question the results presented should also be communicated. When publishing, the idea of "quality over quantity" should be taken into account.

8. Authorship

a. If several authors are involved in a research work or in the scientific text, data or software publication based on it, only those who have made a genuine, comprehensible contribution to the conception of the studies or experiments, or to the preparation, analysis and interpretation of the data and sources (including software, if applicable) or to the formulation of the manuscript itself, and who have agreed to its publication in the final version, may be named as co-authors. Consent to the publication of results may not be refused without sufficient objective justification. The refusal of consent must be justified with a verifiable criticism of data, methods or results or the scientific quality of the publication medium. In the case of several co-authors, the decision on the publication medium requires the consent of all co-authors. Authorship is checked separately in each individual case and depends on the subject area concerned.

b. In recent years, conventions for the publication of original work have become established in the scientific community, particularly in many experimental disciplines, which also allow outsiders to roughly estimate the contributions of co-authors based on their placement in the author line. In this way, the author line also serves the correct external perception and not only the fair recognition of the claims acquired by co-authors through collaboration.

   The scientists agree on who is to be the author of the research results. Agreement on the order of authors is reached in good time, usually at the latest when the manuscript is formulated, on the basis of comprehensible criteria which take the conventions of each subject area into account.

c. The management of the organisational unit in which the publication was created or a superior function is not in itself sufficient to establish authorship. The authors are always jointly responsible for the content, unless this is explicitly stated otherwise; so-called "honourary authorship" is not permitted. Support from third parties must be recognised in an acknowledgement.

d. Authors should ensure and, as far as possible, work towards ensuring that their research contributions are labelled by publishers or infrastructure providers in such a way that they can be correctly cited by users.

9. Publication organ

Authors should carefully select the publication organ - considering its quality and visibility in the respective field of discourse. Academics who take on the role of editor should carefully check for which publication organs they take on this task. A new or unknown publication organ should be checked for its seriousness. A key criterion in the selection decision is whether the publication organ has established its own guidelines for good scientific practice. The scientific quality of an article does not depend on the publication medium in which it was made publicly accessible. In addition to books and specialist journals, specialist repositories, data and software repositories and blogs can also be considered as publication organs.

10. Backup and storage of research data

a. Research data as the basis for publications must generally be stored on durable and secure media for at least ten years in an accessible and reproducible form at the institution where they were created or in repositories across locations, if this is possible. FIAS undertakes to ensure the necessary infrastructure for archiving research data. The retention period begins on the date on which public access is established. It must be ensured that the data remains available in readable form for at least this period. A shortening of the retention periods is possible in justified exceptional cases and must be documented and justified. If there are comprehensible reasons for not retaining certain data, this must be explained by the researchers. Access to the data must be guaranteed for authorised interested parties, in particular the members of the commission for dealing with scientific misconduct and the ombudspersons for dealing with scientific misconduct. This requires sufficiently complete logging and the retention of the logs for at least ten years in order to be able to access the records if published results are disputed by others. In addition, documentation and research results must be protected against manipulation in the best possible way. When developing research software, the source code must be documented.

b. All known relevant information for the realisation of a research result must be documented as comprehensibly as is necessary and appropriate in the subject area concerned in order to be able to review and evaluate the research result. The description of the basic principles is provided to enable replication. Similarly, individual results that do not support the thesis must also be documented. In the event that the documentation of research results cannot fulfil the corresponding (technical) requirements, the given limitations and the reasons must be clearly explained.

c. FIAS shall support the researchers in this respect insofar as appropriate centralised backup procedures can be provided. Centralised FIAS backup procedures are to be used where appropriate.

d. The further details and responsibilities - in particular the requirements for proper logging and the access rules for the use of data - are to be regulated, documented and published by the work areas in a manner appropriate to the scientific orientation and the relevant standards.

11. Data protection

In principle, the anonymisation of personal data is to be assumed. In cases where personal data of test subjects is the subject of research, the research-specific rules of the Hessian Data Protection and Freedom of Information Act (HDSIG), the Federal Data Protection Act (BDSG) and the European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in the respective applicable version must be observed.

12. Legal and ethical framework conditions; Rights of use

a. Researchers take rights and obligations into account, in particular those arising from legal requirements, but also from contracts with third parties, and, if necessary, obtain approvals and ethics votes and submit them to the competent authorities. With regard to research projects, a thorough assessment of the research consequences and the evaluation of the respective ethical aspects should be carried out. The legal framework of a research project also includes documented agreements on the rights of use of the resulting research data and research results.

b. Scientists should be constantly aware of the risk of misuse of research results. Their responsibility is not limited to compliance with legal requirements, but also includes the obligation to use their knowledge, experience and skills in such a way that risks can be recognized, assessed and evaluated. In doing so, they take particular account of the aspects associated with safety-relevant research (dual use).

c. Researchers should, where possible and reasonable, conclude documented agreements on the rights of use of research results and research data at the earliest possible stage in the research project. In particular, the researcher who collects the data is entitled to use it. In the context of an ongoing research project, the authorized users should also decide (in particular in accordance with data protection regulations) whether third parties should have access to the data.

d. Against the background of its responsibility for the conformity of the actions of its members and their relatives with the rules, FIAS promotes this conformity through suitable organizational structures.

13. Conflicts of interest between science and external clients of a private and public nature

a. In the context of cooperation with commercial enterprises, there are many areas of conflict that can almost always be traced back to the collision of scientific interests with political, economic or financial interests. For example, conflicts can arise over the practice of patent applications (patents) or the confidentiality of unpublished data. Secondary activities as an expert or consultant can also lead to conflicts, especially if a certain result is desired by the client but cannot be achieved on the basis of the objectively available data. Membership of supervisory boards or shareholdings in companies that are active in one's own field of research can also lead to significant conflicts of interest.

b. Links with industry should therefore preferably be designed and practiced as equal partnerships. Economic considerations must not take precedence over scientific freedom. If the gain of scientific knowledge comes into an irresolvable conflict with patent law or economic priority, the gain of scientific knowledge must in principle be given priority, even if economic advantages may be lost in the process. For economic reasons alone and without the prospect of gaining new scientific knowledge, no organizational unit of FIAS (work area, etc.) should enter into a commitment with external clients of a private or public nature.

c. In order to prevent conflicts of interest, all persons involved in a research project must disclose their financial and other interests and ties to their superiors or responsible bodies if they could conflict with their research activities. In addition, a strict personal separation of management responsibility in the given organizational unit of FIAS and management activities in commercially active companies (including spin-offs) must be ensured.

C. Scientific misconduct

These basic rules of scientific work (B. 1. - 13.) result in the following understanding of scientific misconduct:

Scientific misconduct occurs when false statements are made deliberately or through gross negligence in a scientifically relevant context, the intellectual property of others is infringed or their research activities are impaired in any other way. The circumstances of the individual case are decisive.

In particular, potentially serious personal misconduct may be considered:

a. Incorrect information

- the invention of data,
- falsifying data, for example by selecting and rejecting undesirable results without disclosing this, by manipulating a representation or image
- incorrect information in a letter of application or an application for funding (including incorrect information on publication organs and publications in print).

b. Infringement of intellectual property relating to a copyrighted work created by another or to essential scientific findings, hypotheses, doctrines or research approaches originating from others:

- unauthorized use under presumption of authorship (plagiarism),
- the presumption or unfounded acceptance of scientific authorship or co-authorship (so-called “honorary authorship”),
- the exploitation of research approaches and ideas, in particular as expert opinions (theft of ideas),
- the falsification of the content,
- unauthorized publication and unauthorized making available to third parties as long as the work, finding, hypothesis, doctrine or research approach has not yet been published.

c. Claiming the (co-)authorship of another person without their consent

d. Sabotage of research activities, including damaging, destroying or tampering with experimental set-ups, equipment, documents, hardware, software, chemicals or other objects that another person needs to carry out an experiment.

e. Removal of primary data insofar as this violates legal provisions or discipline-related recognized principles of scientific work (B. 10.).

Shared responsibility for the misconduct of another person can result from, among other things:

- active participation in the misconduct of others,
- knowledge of counterfeiting by others,
- co-authorship of falsified publications,
- gross neglect of the duty of supervision.

D. The persons and institutions appointed to monitor compliance with the rules of good scientific practice at FIAS

1. General procedural principles

All members and associates of FIAS are required to inform the relevant FIAS offices immediately of any suspicions of scientific misconduct, stating the reasons/reasons. Both the Ombudsperson for Dealing with Scientific Misconduct and the Commission for Dealing with Scientific Misconduct are available at FIAS for this purpose.

2. Persons affected by the allegations

The investigation of allegations of scientific misconduct is carried out in specific cases of suspicion and expressly in compliance with confidentiality and the basic principle of the presumption of innocence. The investigating body shall take into account the basic principle of the presumption of innocence towards the person concerned at every stage of the procedure as part of a case-by-case assessment. The person affected by the allegations should not suffer any disadvantages from the investigation of the suspicion until scientific misconduct has been formally established.

3. Informants

a. One problem with regard to scientific misconduct is that violations are rarely reported or not followed up by the scientific community. Scientists are often reluctant to report their suspicions of scientific misconduct for fear of reprisals, bullying or exclusion and isolation. The whistleblower should not suffer any disadvantages as a result of their actions. On the other hand, younger academics in particular are often not taken seriously by superiors when reporting suspected cases of academic misconduct. FIAS attempts to counteract this through regulations to protect the whistleblower. This protection applies equally to the person affected by the allegations.

b. Scientists who provide a specifiable and comprehensible indication of suspected scientific misconduct within the meaning of these regulations are to be regarded as whistleblowers within the meaning of these regulations.

c. The whistleblower must make the report in good faith. The whistleblower must have objective evidence that standards of good scientific practice may have been violated. Deliberately false or willful allegations may themselves constitute scientific misconduct. If the whistleblower is unable to verify the facts themselves or if there are uncertainties regarding the interpretation of the guidelines for good scientific practice with regard to an observed process, the whistleblower should contact the ombudsperson for dealing with scientific misconduct at FIAS or the "Ombudsman for Science" committee set up by the DFG to clarify the suspicion.

d. If possible, the notification should not lead to delays during the qualification of the whistleblower, especially in the case of academics in the early career phase. The preparation of theses and doctorates should not be disadvantaged; this also applies to working conditions and possible contract extensions.

e. In the event of proceedings before the Commission for the Handling of Scientific Misconduct, the name of the whistleblower should be treated confidentially and only disclosed if the person concerned cannot otherwise defend him/herself properly during the opportunity to comment or if the credibility of the whistleblower needs to be examined. This is intended to ensure that whistleblowers are heard without reprisals and to ensure the fairness of the proceedings.

f. Reports in which the whistleblower does not give his/her name (anonymous report) should also be investigated if the whistleblower presents reliable and sufficiently concrete facts to the body investigating the suspicion.

g. If the whistleblower is known by name, the investigating body should treat the name confidentially and not disclose it to third parties without the corresponding consent. Anything else shall only apply if there is a legal obligation to do so or if the person affected by the allegations would otherwise not be able to defend themselves properly because the identity of the whistleblower is exceptionally important for this. Before the name of the whistleblower is disclosed, he/she will be informed immediately; the whistleblower can decide whether to withdraw the report if it is foreseeable that the name will be disclosed. The confidentiality of the procedure is restricted if the whistleblower goes public with the suspicion. The investigating body decides on such a restriction on a case-by-case basis.

h. The whistleblower shall also be protected in the event of unproven scientific misconduct, provided that the allegations were not demonstrably made against better knowledge.

4. Ombudsperson for dealing with scientific misconduct

FIAS must appoint a neutral, qualified ombudsperson with personal integrity and management experience to advise in cases of conflict in matters of good scientific practice, as well as a deputy in the event of concerns of bias or inability to act.

Contact: ombudsperson@fias.uni-frankfurt.de

a. Tasks and position of the ombudsperson

Anyone who is confronted with concrete circumstances that could give rise to a violation of the rules of good scientific practice or a suspicion of scientific misconduct should be given the opportunity within FIAS to discuss the matter with a neutral and qualified person who can contribute to solution-oriented conflict mediation if necessary, without having to fear disadvantages for themselves or their own working group, while maintaining strict confidentiality.

The ombudsperson is therefore directly available as a person of trust in all matters of good scientific practice and in cases of suspected scientific misconduct.

The institution of the ombudsperson also serves to resolve possible conflict situations that can arise, especially among junior researchers, from the contradiction between loyalty to their superiors or a working group and the obligation to behave in a scientifically correct manner. Ombudspersons should

therefore inform members and relatives in particular that justified whistleblowing (D.3.b. ff.) is not denunciation or behavior that is harmful to the group, but a necessary step in the face of suspected violations of research ethics principles. It is not the whistleblower who expresses a justified suspicion that harms colleagues or the research institution, but the researcher who commits the misconduct.

The ombudsperson or their deputy must treat information about possible misconduct that is brought to their attention as confidential. They are not obliged to disclose this information to the management of the organizational unit concerned (e.g. work area, service unit). In conflict situations, however, the ombudsperson or their deputy may request a meeting with the suspect or the management of the organization concerned.

Alternatively, members and affiliates of FIAS are free to contact the DFG's supra-regional, independent "Ombudsman for Science" instead of the FIAS ombudsperson for scientific misconduct (right to vote).

b. Appointment and term of office of the ombudspersons

The ombudsperson and their deputy are appointed for a period of three years by the Foundation Board from among the group of FIAS Fellows on the recommendation of the Board of Directors. A one-time reappointment is possible, whereby both a term of office as ombudsperson and a term of office as deputy are to be considered. The ombudsperson and their deputy should not belong to the same field of work. The appointed ombudsperson and their deputy should not perform any other functions that could lead to a conflict of interest. The ombudspersons should report to the Director on their work once a year in anonymized form. In the event of bias or incapacity, the ombudsperson shall be represented by their deputy. In order to increase the functionality of the ombudsperson system, FIAS will take measures to relieve the ombudspersons in other ways if necessary. The ombudspersons are made known at FIAS in an appropriate form.

5. Commission for dealing with scientific misconduct

A commission for dealing with scientific misconduct has been appointed to investigate suspected cases of scientific misconduct at FIAS. Due to the diverse academic connections to Goethe University Frankfurt, FIAS uses the commission set up there, whose management can be contacted at Komm.wiss.Fehlverhalten@em.uni-frankfurt.de

The tasks and working methods of this committee are based on the "Statutes of the Johann Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt am Main for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice" and are adapted below for use at FIAS.

a. Tasks and position of the commission for dealing with scientific misconduct

The Commission is responsible for investigating any circumstances that suggest concrete scientific misconduct by a member or a member of staff of FIAS. The Commission is also responsible if the member or member of staff has left FIAS in the meantime, but the possible misconduct occurred during their time at FIAS.

The Commission for Dealing with Academic Misconduct can be called upon by the ombudspersons as well as by any member or member of staff of FIAS in the event of concrete, objective suspicions of academic misconduct. The appeal must be made in text form to the management of the Commission (Komm.wiss.Fehlverhalten@em.uni-frankfurt.de).

In appropriate cases, the Chairperson of the Commission for Dealing with Academic Misconduct may suggest that the whistleblower first contact the FIAS ombudsperson (D. 1. and 4.). In the event of suspicion of particularly serious scientific misconduct (C.), the ombudspersons should report this case to the Commission without delay.

The Commission meets in closed sessions. Meetings may be held in person or in the form of a video or telephone conference. In appropriate cases, the Chairperson of the Commission may also arrange for resolutions to be passed by way of circulation in electronic form. Until scientific misconduct is proven, the information about the parties involved in the proceedings and the findings to date will be treated confidentially. The person affected by the allegations and the whistleblower must be given the opportunity to comment at every stage of the procedure. Commission members who appear to be biased shall not take part in the consultation and voting on a specific individual case. The Commission shall decide on the question of bias after pointing out the circumstances that may give rise to bias, excluding the member of the Commission concerned. The provisions of the Hessian Administrative Procedure Act shall apply mutatis mutandis to the procedure, unless otherwise specified below. The proceedings of the Commission do not replace other proceedings regulated by law or the Articles of Association (e.g. regulatory proceedings of the FIAS, disciplinary proceedings, labor court proceedings, criminal proceedings).

b. Appointment and term of office of the members of the Commission for Dealing with Academic Misconduct

More detailed regulations on the appointment and term of office of the commission are set out in the corresponding university statutes.

If necessary, the commission co-opts an additional member from the circle of FIAS scientists for individual cases, provided that this field of work is not already represented by the members of the commission. The Chairperson of the Commission will inform the Director of FIAS of the co-option request. The Director will then select a corresponding representative of the work area from the group of Senior Fellows or perform the function himself/herself. In the event of possible bias on the part of the Director, another member of the Directorate can be nominated as a member to be co-opted. However, the co-opted member has no voting rights and only participates in the meetings of the Commission in an advisory capacity.

The Commission is quorate if at least four members with voting rights are present. Commission decisions require a simple majority of the members present. The commission elects a chairperson from among its members. Minutes shall be taken of the meetings of the Commission, recording the main outcome of the meetings.

E. Procedure in the event of suspected scientific misconduct

1. General regulations and general register

Once a case has been brought to the attention of the Commission for Dealing with Academic Misconduct (D.5. a.), the management must inform the Commission immediately.

For this purpose, the Executive Board shall create a case (electronic file) for each case brought to its attention and initially enter the case in the General Register (AR) of the Commission.

Pending the conclusion of the proceedings before the Commission for Dealing with Academic Misconduct, parallel proceedings pending at institute or department level in the same matter shall be suspended. If

proceedings are pending with the German Research Foundation (DFG) or other non-university institutions in the same matter, the proceedings before the Commission must be suspended in case of doubt after consultation with the DFG or the other non-university institutions.

FIAS shall ensure that the entire procedure is carried out as promptly as possible and shall take the necessary steps to complete each stage of the procedure within a reasonable period of time.

2. Commission decision on the further progress of the proceedings

Once the case has been submitted, the Commission first examines, on the basis of the written documents submitted and the facts otherwise known, whether there might actually be sufficient suspicion of scientific misconduct if the alleged facts intended to prove scientific misconduct could be proven with the means of clarification available to the Commission (E. 3.). As a rule, it decides in an oral meeting (D. 5. a.); in appropriate cases (e.g. also in cases of particular urgency), the chairperson may initiate a written circulation procedure.

If the committee concludes that there is sufficient suspicion of scientific misconduct, the committee decides to initiate proceedings (E. 3.). The decision must be recorded in the files.

3. Proceedings before the Commission for the Investigation of Reasonable Suspicion of Scientific Misconduct

Once the proceedings before the Commission have been initiated, the Commission will give the person affected by the suspected misconduct the opportunity to make a statement, stating the incriminating facts and evidence. The person concerned shall be given a reasonable period of up to one month to respond.

After receiving the statement from the person concerned or after the deadline set has expired, the Commission shall immediately take a decision on whether and which further clarification measures are required. The person affected by the suspected misconduct shall be heard orally by the Commission at his/her request; he/she may be assisted by a person he/she trusts. This also applies to other persons to be heard, such as the reporting person, witnesses or other persons concerned.

Once the further clarification measures have been completed or are not required, the Commission shall decide without delay, in full consideration of the evidence it has gathered, whether scientific misconduct has occurred or whether the proceedings can be discontinued due to a lack of scientific misconduct or due to insignificance, informing the person concerned and the reporting person of the main reasons.

Discontinuation due to insignificance may be considered in particular if only minor scientific misconduct has been established and the person concerned has contributed to the clarification of the matter, has taken measures to make amends or has already taken measures to remedy any damage that has occurred.

If it is not possible to discontinue the proceedings, the Commission shall establish the existence of scientific misconduct (which may be serious according to the criteria set out in C.) in writing in a decision to be substantiated. Prior to the final decision on the measures to be taken (E. 4.), the person concerned must be informed. He*she shall be given the opportunity to comment again within a reasonable period of no more than one month.

At the request of the data subject or his/her authorized representative, the data subject shall be granted access to the files insofar as knowledge of the files is necessary to assert or defend the legal interests of the data subject. This right does not extend to the disclosure of the reporting person if this would impair the

proper fulfillment of the tasks of FIAS or if this must be kept secret by law or by its nature. In all other respects, the regulations contained in D.3. apply with regard to the disclosure of the name of the whistleblower.

4. Measures to sanction scientific misconduct at FIAS

Depending on the nature and seriousness of the misconduct found, the Commission may in particular decide on one or more of the following measures:

a. The written reprimand of the person concerned by the commission, which is usually also to be brought to the attention of the affected work area or other organizational unit to which the person concerned belongs.
b. The recommendation of measures to the Board of Directors or the other organizational unit concerned, provided that the latter is responsible for implementing the measure, or to third parties.

These include in particular

- a written request to the person concerned to withdraw a publication or to correct incorrect data (in particular by publishing an erratum) or to include a reference to the omitted naming of co-authors in an appropriate manner,

- the reversal of internal funding decisions (in particular the recall of funds approved by FIAS),

- informing the department concerned at the home university with reference to the examination of the need to revoke or withdraw academic titles and degrees, and

- informing any third-party funders.

The final result of the commission must be communicated, together with the main reasons, to the person concerned, the department or other organizational unit concerned, the Board of Directors and, on request, to the person making the reference and other persons or institutions (in particular scientific publication organs or scientific institutions) who may have a justified interest in the decision.

5. Final provisions

The Commission's decision is final for FIAS with regard to the determination of the existence or non-existence of (serious) scientific misconduct. There is no internal appeal procedure against the Commission's decision within FIAS.

With regard to the following measures, the Commission makes recommendations - with the exception of the reprimand (E. 4. a.). The Directorate and the divisions or other organizational unit concerned shall implement the Commission's recommendation without delay within the scope of their discretion with regard to the type of measure to be taken. They shall also inform the Commission without delay, to the extent permitted by law, of the nature of the measure taken and the date of its implementation.

In the event that a measure is recommended for which the work areas or the other organizational units concerned provide for the implementation of a separate legal procedure, such as in the case of a title withdrawal, the work areas or the other organizational unit concerned reserve the right to carry out a procedure on their own responsibility. In order to conduct the proceedings, the Commission will provide the

work area or other organizational unit concerned with all documents from the proceedings before the Commission (E. 1. - 4.).

The Executive Board will decide on the publication of the Commission's decision on dealing with scientific misconduct in individual cases where there is a legitimate public interest, after consulting the Commission.

The Statutes of the Frankfurt Institute for Advanced Studies on Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice shall enter into force in their amended version after their publication at FIAS. At the same time, the principles of the Frankfurt Institute for Advanced Studies (FIAS) for safeguarding good scientific practice published on January 21, 2013 shall cease to apply.

Frankfurt, 16 November 2023

signed by Prof. Dr. Eckhard Elsen

Scientific Director of Frankfurt Institute for Advanced Studies (FIAS)