

# RULES FOR ENSURING GOOD SCIENTIFIC PRACTICE

at the Kiel Institute for the World Economy (IfW Kiel) Foundation

and

## PROCEDURES FOR DEALING WITH SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT

### Introduction

Scientific integrity forms the basis of trustworthy science. It is an expression of commitment to science that includes respectful interaction with each other, with study participants and the environment, and strengthens and promotes society's indispensable trust in science. The constitutionally guaranteed freedom of science is inseparably linked to a corresponding responsibility. Being fully aware of this responsibility and establishing it as a benchmark for one's own actions are first and foremost the tasks of every scientist as well as of those institutions in which science is pursued. Science itself ensures good scientific practice through honest thought and action, not least through organisational and procedural rules. Whistleblowers, for example, who report a justified suspicion of scientific misconduct, fulfil an indispensable function for the self-regulation of science.

As a research institution and member of the Leibniz Association, IfW Kiel is obliged, within the scope of its own responsibilities, to protect science and itself from falsification, to encourage its scientists to comply with the rules of good scientific practice and to take action against misuse and manipulation of scientific results. In these guidelines for safeguarding good scientific practice and for dealing with allegations of scientific misconduct, the IfW Kiel commits itself to the "Guidelines for Good Scientific Practice" by the Leibniz Association, thereby recognising the "Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice" by the German Research Foundation (DFG) in its current version as a legally binding frame of reference for the application of these guidelines.

### Section I: Rules of good scientific practice

#### § 1 Good scientific practice

- (1) Scientists are responsible for implementing the fundamental values and standards of scientific work in their actions and for standing up for them. They shall use the freedom of research guaranteed by the constitution responsibly. Scientists at all career levels shall regularly update their familiarity with the standards of good scientific practice. Imparting the basics of good scientific work should begin at the earliest possible stage in academic teaching and scientific training.

- (2) Good scientific practice means in particular, at every step of the research process:
- a) to work *lege artis*, i.e., to know, and act according to, the current state of knowledge and to apply the latest methods;
  - b) to maintain strict honesty with regard to one's own and third-party contributions;
  - c) to allow and encourage doubt and self-criticism, i.e., to critically examine and check findings, *inter alia* by means of mutual reviews within working groups, but also through honest appraisal of contributions by colleagues, staff, competitors, and predecessors.
- (3) Careful, continuous quality assurance at every step of the research process is an important characteristic of scientific honesty. Along with honesty towards oneself and other ethical standards, it is the basis for scientific professionalism. It is ensured, among other things, by (critical) cooperation in scientific working groups and clear structures of responsibility. Quality assurance includes in particular:
- a) comprehensively considering and recognising published research achievements when identifying relevant and appropriate research questions and planning research projects;
  - b) adhering to subject-specific standards and established methods in the research process, in relation to the calibration of models, the collection, processing and analysis of research data, or the selection, development and use of research software; particular emphasis should be placed on quality assurance and the establishment of standards when developing new methods;
  - c) critically and consistently checking the validity of all results of empirical and model-based analyses, experiments and other research designs;
  - d) ensuring as far as possible that published results and findings can be replicated by other scientists, including the creation of access opportunities for authorised third parties to the information necessary for replication.
- (4) Methods to avoid (unconscious) biases in the analysis or interpretation of findings should be applied as far as possible. Researchers should examine the extent to which gender and diversity may be significant for a research project (e.g., with regard to the research hypotheses or the composition of the research data set). When interpreting findings, the respective framework conditions should be taken into account.
- (5) Researchers must document all the information relevant for arriving at a research result—in particular the data, literature, methods, evaluation and analysis steps and, if applicable, the origin of the hypothesis—in a comprehensible manner that is necessary and appropriate in their respective field so as to verify and evaluate the result. In principle, they should therefore also document results that do not support the research hypothesis. The selection of results must be avoided at this stage. If concrete professional recommendations exist for the review and evaluation, researchers should document the results according to these recommendations. Protocols of experiments should record the experiment's objective, conditions, procedure and result in a comprehensible manner and in a form that cannot be altered subsequently. When research software is developed, the source code must be documented. If the documentation does not meet these requirements, the limitations and the reasons for this must be explained in a comprehensible manner. Documentation and research results must not be manipulated; they must be protected against manipulation as far as possible. Wherever possible, third parties should be granted access to this information.

- (6) Good scientific practice also includes:
- a) thorough assessment of the consequences of research and evaluation of the relevant ethical aspects. Scientists should always remain alert to the risk of misuse of research results and in so doing, their responsibility should not be limited to compliance with legal requirements but should also include the obligation to use their knowledge, experience and skills in such a way that risks—including those associated with safety-relevant research (dual use)—can be identified, assessed and evaluated.
  - b) respecting rights and obligations, in particular those stemming from legal requirements or contracts with third parties, including compliance with data protection regulations and obtaining and submitting necessary approvals and ethics votes. These legal requirements of a research project also include documented agreements on the rights of use of research data and research results arising from the project.
  - c) ensuring that all published research results and research data as well as the central materials on which they are based and any research software used are adequately backed up and securely stored in accordance with the standards of the field of work for a period of ten years. If there are comprehensible reasons for not retaining certain data (e.g., data protection regulations), this must be explained in a comprehensible manner.
  - d) publicly updating findings already published in which their authors have subsequently noticed discrepancies or errors. If the discrepancies or errors justify retraction of a publication, the researchers shall contact the respective publisher, infrastructure provider, etc. as quickly as possible to ensure that the correction or retraction takes place and is marked accordingly. The same applies if the researchers are informed of such discrepancies or errors by third parties.

## § 2 Organisational structures

The Board of Directors and the employees entrusted with the scientific management of research centres (henceforth referred to as "scientific management staff") are responsible for the communication of and compliance with good scientific practice as well as for management, supervision, conflict management and quality assurance of scientific work at IfW Kiel. The scientific management staff are responsible for an entire given unit. They must ensure, inter alia, by putting in place suitable organisational structures, the preconditions for scientists (henceforth referred to as "scientific staff") and for non-scientific staff, enabling them to comply with legal and ethical standards. In particular, they must see to it that:

- (1) Binding principles for research ethics and procedures for the appropriate assessment of research projects are established with the participation of the scientific staff and that the scientific and non-scientific staff are aware of such principles.
- (2) The scientific staff and non-scientific staff must abide by these principles.
- (3) Clear, written policies and procedures must be in place for staff recruitment and staff development and for the promotion of young researchers and equal opportunities;
  - a) with regard to staff recruitment and staff development, gender equality and diversity should be taken into account transparently and unconscious biases avoided as far as possible;
  - b) with regard to the promotion of young researchers, sincere advice for career guidance and further career paths, training opportunities and mentoring should be offered to academic and non-academic staff;

- (4) Scientific staff must be able to work *lege artis*, which requires in particular access to published research outputs.
- (5) Scientific and non-scientific staff should enjoy a balance of support and personal responsibility appropriate to their career stage to enable them to shape their careers through increasing autonomy.
- (6) Abuse of power and exploitation of relationships of dependency should be prevented by appropriate organisational measures at all levels.
- (7) The size and organisation of the research and service centres should be designed in such a way that the tasks of management, supervision, quality assurance, passing on skills and conflict regulation are clearly assigned, can be adequately performed and are appropriately communicated to the relevant members. In particular, care should be taken to ensure that
  - a) the interaction of the members of the centres is such that the centre as a whole can fulfil its tasks;
  - b) the necessary cooperation and coordination takes place;
  - c) the performance of management tasks is accompanied by the corresponding responsibility;
  - d) all scientific and non-scientific staff are aware of their roles, rights and duties. With this in mind, staff should interact regularly, define their roles and responsibilities in an appropriate manner, and adjust these roles if required, for example, by changes in staff members' work focus;
  - e) young researchers receive appropriate individual supervision embedded in the overall concept of IfW Kiel.

### **§ 3 Evaluation criteria**

- (1) The evaluation of the performance of scientists primarily follows qualitative standards. Quantitative indicators can be included in the overall evaluation only in a differentiated and reflective manner. Originality and quality should always take precedence over quantity in the evaluation of academic performance. In addition to the acquisition of knowledge and its critical reflection, other aspects should be taken into account in the evaluation, including
  - a) commitment to knowledge and technology transfer, to policy advice, public relations, teaching and institute committees;
  - b) the scientific attitude of scientists, such as openness to knowledge and willingness to take risks;
  - c) personal, family or health-related absences, or longer training or qualification periods, alternative career paths or comparable circumstances stemming from these absences.
- (2) The evaluation may also take appropriate account of contributions for the benefit of society as a whole or individual peculiarity in CVs.

## § 4 Rights of use and data

- (1) Researchers shall, as far as possible and reasonable, conclude documented agreements on the rights of use of research data and research results arising from a project at the earliest possible stage of the research project. Documented agreements are particularly useful if a research project involves several academic or non-academic institutions or if it is foreseeable that a researcher will change research institutions and would like to continue using the data generated by him/her for (his/her own) research purposes.
- (2) The scientist in particular who collects the data shall be entitled to use it. In an ongoing research project, the authorised users shall decide (in particular in accordance with privacy provisions) whether third parties should be granted access to the data.
- (3) The research data on which published research results are based shall be secured and kept accessible and traceable for ten years in accordance with the standards of the field of research, unless this is incompatible with privacy provisions. The retention period begins on the date on which public access was granted. Comprehensible reasons for not retaining certain data or for retaining them only for a shortened period must be explained. The data may be stored at IfW Kiel or in repositories at different locations.
- (4) The management staff with responsibility in this respect shall lay down clear guidelines and rules on how to record and document data and shall make available the necessary infrastructure.

## § 5 Publication

- (1) As a rule, all research results obtained at IfW Kiel shall be made available as part of the academic discourse. In specific cases, however, there may be reasons not to make results publicly available in the form of publications or via other communication channels. In such cases, this decision must not depend on third parties. Researchers should decide for themselves—with due regard for the conventions of the relevant subject area—whether, how and where to disseminate their results.
- (2) Authors should select the publication medium carefully, with due regard for its quality and visibility in the relevant field of research. In addition to publications in books and journals, authors may also consider academic repositories, data and software repositories, and blogs. The scientific quality of a contribution should not depend on the publication medium. A key criterion to selecting a publication medium is whether it has established guidelines on good research practice. A new or unknown publication medium should be evaluated to assess its integrity.
- (3) In line with the principle of “quality over quantity”, researchers should avoid splitting research into inappropriately small publications. They should limit the repetition of content from publications of which they were (co-)authors to the extent necessary to enable the reader to understand the context. They should cite results previously made publicly available unless, in exceptional cases, this is deemed unnecessary by the general conventions of the field of research.
- (4) In order to ensure the verifiability of the scientific investigation, the publication must provide a complete and comprehensible description of the results, unless the particular form of the publication (e.g. abstract, short communication) explicitly excludes this. The complete and comprehensible description of the results should also, as far as this is possible and reasonable,
  - a) completely and correctly cite one's own work and previous work by other researchers;
  - b) fully and correctly substantiate the origins, reuse and characteristics of the research data, software and other materials on which the results are based, citing the original sources;

- c) comprehensively describe the work processes and the quality assurance mechanisms applied;
  - d) describe the nature and extent of the research data generated in the research process;
  - e) make available the methods used and the software employed. Self-programmed software shall be made publicly accessible along with the source code, and be licensed appropriately, where applicable.
- (5) Where possible, publications, including the underlying research data, materials, information, methods and software, should be deposited and made accessible in recognised archives and repositories in accordance with the FAIR principles (“Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Re-Usable”).
- (6) Findings that support the authors' hypotheses and findings that reject these hypotheses must be reported in equal measure.

## § 6 Authorship

- (1) An essential aspect of good scientific practice is the responsibility of (co-)authorship. The authors of scientific publications are jointly responsible for the contents of their publications. Each author should be accountable, identify with the scientific results and take responsibility for the content of the publication. Instances in which the responsibility of authors only extends to one part of the publication must be explicitly indicated and justified. All authors should agree on the final version of the work to be published. Refusal to consent to publication must be justified with a verifiable criticism of data, methods or results.
- (2) Scientists shall agree on who is to be the author of the publication. Those who have made a genuine, identifiable contribution to the scientific content of an original scientific publication shall be named as the authors. What constitutes a genuine and identifiable contribution must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and depends on the subject area. A genuine, identifiable contribution is deemed to exist in particular if a scientist has contributed in a research-relevant way to
- a) the conceptual design of the study;
  - b) the gathering, collection, acquisition, provision, processing, analysis or interpretation of the data; or
  - c) 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.
- (3) Honorary authorship is not permissible. A leadership or supervisory function does not itself constitute co-authorship. Securing research funding or reading and commenting on manuscripts likewise does not constitute co-authorship.
- (4) Authors shall 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.
- (5) Agreement on the citation order of authors should be reached 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 fields of research.
- (6) Researchers who take on the role of editing should carefully select where they will carry out this activity.

## **§ 7 Confidentiality and neutrality in assessments and consultations**

- (1) Researchers who, in particular, evaluate submitted manuscripts, funding proposals or personal qualifications are obliged to maintain strict confidentiality with regard to this process. This precludes sharing the material with third parties or making personal use of it. They must immediately disclose to the responsible body any facts that may give rise to concerns of bias or conflicts of interest.
- (2) These duties to maintain confidentiality and disclose facts that could give rise to the appearance of a conflict of interest also apply to members of research advisory and decision-making bodies.

## **§ 8 Conflicts of interest**

- (1) Possible conflicts of interest must be publicly documented by the authors of scientific papers and other publications.
- (2) All externally funded projects must be published on the IfW Kiel website, including the name of the commissioning institution.
- (3) Scientific papers and other publications must state sources of funding and other forms of external support.

## **§ 9 Ombudsman**

- (1) For the mediation or settlement of disputes, disagreements or suspicions in connection with good scientific practice, all members and affiliates of IfW Kiel may turn to IfW Kiel's independent ombudsperson or—in case of concern about conflicts of interest or if this person is unavailable—to the deputy ombudsperson. Alternatively, they may also turn to the Leibniz Association's ombudsman committee or the DFG's "German Research Ombudsman" committee.
- (2) The ombudspersons of IfW Kiel are scientists with management experience (e.g. project management, supervision of students or doctoral candidates) who have the personal integrity and objective judgement required for the performance of their duties. They shall exercise their office in an honorary capacity, neutrally, independently and free from instructions.
- (3) The ombudspersons are chosen from IfW Kiel's scientific staff. The scientific management staff at IfW Kiel mentioned in § 2 are not eligible for election. The term of office of the ombudspersons is five years; re-election is permitted once.
- (4) All members of IfW Kiel's scientific staff are entitled to nominate ombudspersons. A nomination shall only be considered if the person nominated has declared his or her willingness to accept the duty.
- (5) The ombudspersons shall provide advice as neutral and qualified contact persons in questions of good scientific practice and in suspected cases of scientific misconduct and shall contribute, as far as possible, to solution-oriented conflict mediation. Specifically, they have the following duties and rights:
  - a) to inform about the rules of good scientific practice;
  - b) to propose advancements of these rules;
  - c) to advise on questions of scientific misconduct;
  - d) to examine relevant information and attempt to clarify the facts;

- e) to examine the options through discussions with the parties involved in order to settle allegations or conflicts;
  - f) to inform the Institute's management if allegations or conflicts persist.
- (7) The ombudspersons are bound to confidentiality.
- (8) All members of the scientific staff have the right to speak to the ombudspersons personally within a short period of time.
- (9) The management at the Institute shall ensure that the election of the ombudspersons is carried out properly and that their work is sufficiently visible, independent and supported at IfW Kiel. The ombudspersons shall be supported during the exercise of their office by all parties involved and shall be accorded recognition for the performance of their tasks. In order to increase the efficiency of the ombudsperson system, other measures shall be taken to relieve the ombudspersons if necessary.
- (10) The ombudsperson or deputy ombudsperson may be dismissed by at least two-thirds of the votes of the scientific staff if he or she has persistently and seriously violated his or her duties such that the long-term reliability of the fulfilment of the ombudsperson's duties no longer appears possible or confidence in the proper fulfilment of the ombudsperson's duties no longer exists. The ombudsperson in question must be heard prior to a decision to dismiss.

## **Section II**

### **Procedures for dealing with scientific misconduct**

#### **§ 10 Scientific misconduct**

Scientific misconduct occurs when, in a context relevant to science, false statements are made intentionally or through gross negligence, the intellectual property of others is violated or their research activities are impaired in any other way. Scientific misconduct includes

- (1) False statements and misrepresentations in a scientifically relevant context, in particular:
  - a) Falsification of data or research results, e.g.
    - (i) invention of data or research results;
    - (ii) selection of desirable results or rejection of undesirable results without disclosing this;
    - (iii) manipulation of a representation or illustration;
    - (iv) provision of inaccurate information in publication lists, application letters or grant applications (including misrepresentation concerning the publication medium and publications in print);
    - (v) multiple publication of data or text without appropriate disclosure;
  - b) Destruction of research data if this violates legal provisions or recognised principles of scientific work;
  - c) Unlawful non-destruction of (in particular personal) data.
- (2) The infringement of intellectual property rights, in particular:
  - a) in relation to legally protected work created by others, or in relation to essential scientific findings, hypotheses, tenets or research approaches originating from others:



- (i) unauthorised adoption or other use of passages without adequate proof of authorship (plagiarism);
  - (ii) exploitation of research approaches and ideas without consent, especially as a reviewer;
  - (iii) presumption or unfounded assumption of scientific authorship or co-authorship as well as the denial of such authorship;
  - (iv) falsification of contents;
  - (v) unauthorised publication and unauthorised disclosure to third parties as long as the work, finding, hypothesis, tenet or research approach has not yet been lawfully published;
  - b) Claiming (co-)authorship with another person without that person's consent;
  - c) Non-acknowledgement of (co-)authorship with another person.
- (3) Unfair obstruction of the research activities of others, e.g.
- (i) sabotage such as damaging, destroying or tampering with work materials, data or programs;
  - (ii) deliberately false, grossly erroneous or misleading peer reviews of the research of others and preparation of favourable opinions;
  - (iii) use of data without the consent of the author or acknowledgement of the source.
- (4) Neglect of scientific management responsibilities and supervisory duties by management staff in a way that encourages breaches of good scientific practice;
- (5) Deliberately faking the implementation or use of quality assurance measures and procedures (such as peer reviews);
- (6) Co-authorship with the acceptance of participation in a falsified publication.

## **§ 11 Initiation and implementation of the procedure**

- (1) In case of concrete suspicions of scientific misconduct, IfW Kiel's ombudsperson must be informed. If the suspicion of misconduct directly concerns the ombudsperson or if the latter's impartiality is in question for other reasons, the deputy ombudsperson must be informed. The informant's report must be based on objective evidence of a possible violation and must be made in good faith. Deliberately inaccurate or wanton allegations may themselves constitute scientific misconduct. If the report is filed anonymously, the ombudsperson will decide on a case-by-case basis whether to investigate the report. Anonymous reports can only be investigated if they contain reliable and sufficiently concrete facts. If the informant is unable to check the facts him- or herself or if there is uncertainty about the interpretation of the rules of good scientific practice with regard to an observed event, he or she may also contact the Leibniz Association's ombudsman committee or the DFG's "German Research Ombudsman" committee to clarify the suspicion.
- (2) The facts on which the suspicion is based shall be investigated without delay. The persons concerned shall be informed of the commencement of these investigations. The ombudsperson shall initially conduct a preliminary examination of the allegations, which should take no longer than one week, and shall record the result of this examination in writing. If the suspicion cannot be dispelled in the course of this preliminary examination and if the misconduct in question is not minor, the ombudsperson shall convene an investigative committee, which shall establish the

facts of the case by hearing all the parties involved and, if applicable, other persons who can contribute to clarification of the facts and shall decide whether the suspicion of misconduct is invalidated, whether the misconduct should be regarded as proven or whether further investigations are necessary. The facts relevant to this decision shall be recorded in writing.

- (3) The investigating committee shall be made up of five members, including one member from the scientific management staff and the ombudsperson as an advisory, non-voting member. The ombudsperson shall ensure the independence and impartiality of the members of the committee and shall provide for at least one substitute for each member who can take over in case a member is unable to attend or there are concerns about partiality. The committee shall appoint the chair from among its members. It shall take all decisions by simple majority. In the event of a tie, the chair shall have the casting vote. Reasoned minority votes are permissible.
- (4) All persons involved in investigations are bound by the standards of good scientific practice and the definitions of scientific misconduct set out in these Guidelines at every stage of the proceedings. In addition, they must take into account the recognised professional standards and align their work with the customary principles of establishing the truth in accordance with the principle of the free assessment of evidence.
- (5) All persons involved in the investigation must, at every stage of the process, do their utmost to protect both the informant and the person affected by the allegations. The investigation of allegations of scientific misconduct shall be carried out expressly with due regard for confidentiality and—on a case-by-case basis—the fundamental principle of the presumption of innocence. The informant and, as long as scientific misconduct has not been formally established, the person affected by the allegations should not incur any detriment for their own scientific or professional advancement as a result of the investigation. In particular, the investigation should not delay the qualification of the informant in the case of junior researchers or hinder the preparation of theses and doctorates; the same applies to working conditions and possible contract renewals. During the investigation phase, the name of the informant must not be disclosed to the person concerned or third parties without his/her consent. The only exception to this is if there is a legal obligation to do so or if the person affected by the allegations cannot otherwise defend him- or herself properly because the informant's identity is exceptionally important for this purpose. Before the name of the informant is disclosed, he or she must be informed without delay; he or she can decide whether to withdraw the complaint to avoid disclosure of his or her identity. The confidentiality of the procedure will be limited if the informant turns to the public with the suspicion. The investigating body must decide on a case-by-case basis how to deal with this breach of confidentiality. The informant must also be protected in case of unproven scientific misconduct, unless it can be proven that the report of the allegations was made against the informant's better judgment.
- (6) At each stage of the investigation procedure, the person affected by the allegations and the informant shall be given the opportunity to comment. The person affected by the suspicion of misconduct shall be given the opportunity to comment at the latest one week after the suspicion has become known, stating the incriminating facts and evidence. The period for this statement shall not be less than two weeks.
- (7) Upon completion of its investigations, the investigating committee shall immediately inform IfW Kiel's Board of Directors in writing of its findings. If a member of the Board of Directors is personal-

ly affected by allegations, this notification shall be made to the Chair of the Scientific Advisory Board. The Board of Directors or the Chair of the Scientific Advisory Board shall inform the person affected by the allegations, the informant, IfW Kiel's Staff Council, the Ombudsperson of the Leibniz Association and, if applicable, third parties who have a justified interest in the decision about the result of the investigation.

- (8) If a final clarification of the allegations by the bodies of IfW Kiel is not possible or if the implementation of the procedure is not possible due to extraordinary circumstances, IfW Kiel's ombudsperson, in consultation with the Board of Directors or the Chair of the Scientific Advisory Board, shall commission the Leibniz Association's ombudsman committee with the further implementation of the procedure. In this case, the procedure will be conducted in accordance with the regulations of the Leibniz Association.

## § 12 Proven misconduct

- (1) If scientific misconduct is regarded as proven, the Board of Directors or the Chair of the Scientific Advisory Board shall decide on the need for further measures as they see fit. In doing so, the staff council, the equal opportunity commissioner and, if applicable, the disabled persons representative shall be involved in accordance with applicable laws.
- (2) Depending on the circumstances of the individual case and in particular the seriousness of the misconduct, sanctions from a wide variety of legal fields may be imposed, which may be cumulative, including
  - a) Consequences under labour law
    - written reprimand
    - warning
    - extraordinary termination
    - termination of contract
  - b) Academic consequences
    - withdrawal of doctoral degree
    - withdrawal of authorisation to teach
  - c) Consequences under civil law
    - ban on entering the premises
    - claims for restitution against the person concerned, e.g., for the return of misappropriated academic material
    - claims for removal and injunctive relief under copyright law, personality rights law, patent law, competition law
    - claims for restitution, e.g., of scholarships or third-party funds
    - claims for damages by the Institute or third parties
  - d) Consequences under criminal law
  - e) Revocation of scientific publications.
- (3) If, after scientific misconduct has been established, the withdrawal of an academic degree is considered as a measure, the competent authorities shall be involved.
- (4) Scientific publications that are erroneous due to proven scientific misconduct shall be withdrawn if they are still unpublished, or corrected if they have already been published (revocation).

Cooperation partners—if necessary—should be informed in an appropriate manner. In principle, the authors and editors involved are obliged to do so. If they do not take action within a reasonable period of time, the IfW Kiel's management will initiate the appropriate measures.

- (5) In the event of gross scientific misconduct, the IfW Kiel's management may inform other research institutions, professional organisations, third parties concerned or the public if this appears necessary to protect third parties or to avoid damage to the scientific reputation of IfW Kiel.
- (6) The rights of affected persons will not be restricted as a result.

### § 13 Entry into force

The Rules for Ensuring Good Scientific Practice at IfW Kiel and Procedures for Dealing with Scientific Misconduct will come into force when they are announced internally at the Institute.

Kiel, 01.12.21



Prof. Holger Görg, PhD.  
Acting President



Prof. Dr. Stefan Kooths  
Acting Vice President



Birgit Austen-Bosy  
Administrative Director