



Code of Research Conduct

Incorporating procedures for the investigation of allegations of research misconduct

CONTENTS

I Purpose, Scope and Standards.....	2
II Principles.....	3
III Upholding the Code	6
Responsibilities of researchers	6
Responsibilities of the School	6
IV Procedures for the investigation of allegations of research misconduct.....	7
Preliminary steps	9
Screening Stage.....	11
Formal investigation.....	12
Reporting and records management.....	12
Appeals.....	13
Annex A: School and external resources	14
Annex B: Flowchart of the procedure for the investigation of allegations of research misconduct	16
Annex C: Publication ethics	17

I Purpose, Scope and Standards

1. The School is committed to maintaining the integrity and probity of academic research. All research should be conducted to the highest levels of ethics and integrity and it is of fundamental importance that the conduct of research and the dissemination of the results of research should be in accordance with the principles of independence, rigour, objectivity, fairness and professionalism, to ensure that findings are robust and defensible.
2. This Code of Research Conduct applies to all members of the School (including but not limited to students, academic and research staff, honorary and visiting staff, as well as those engaged as Consultants or Sub-contractors) in line with requirements set out by national and international regulatory bodies, professional and regulatory research guidance and research ethics frameworks issued in appropriate areas. It accompanies the School's Research Ethics Policy¹ which applies to all research involving human participants, user-generated data or data relating to directly identifiable human subjects, and forms a part of the School's overarching Ethics Code². It applies to all outputs identified by the author as research, explicitly or implicitly, and all outputs communicating the outcomes, findings or conclusions of research, wherever they are published.
3. This Code of Research Conduct is consistent with the UUK *Concordat to Support Research Integrity*³, UKRI *Policy on the Governance of Good Research Practice*⁴, the UKRIO *Code of Practice for Research: Promoting Good Practice and Preventing Misconduct*⁵ and *Procedure for the Investigation of Misconduct in Research*⁶, and the *European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity*⁷.
4. It is the responsibility of all individuals to ensure their own compliance with this Code and related policies. Links to the relevant School policies and resources regarding good research conduct can be found at Annex A. Similarly, the School accepts its responsibilities as the employer of investigators.
5. All allegations of breaches of the Code will be investigated by the School in accordance with the Procedures for the investigation of allegations of research misconduct outlined in section IV below. A flowchart of the procedure can be found at Annex B.
6. Any comments or queries regarding the Code should be addressed in the first instance to the Research Governance Manager via research.conduct@lse.ac.uk

¹ <https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/resEthPolPro.pdf>

² <https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/divisions/Secretarys-Division/Ethics/Ethics-Code>

³ <http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/highereducation/Pages/Theconcordattoosupportresearchintegrity.aspx>

⁴ <https://www.ukri.org/publications/ukri-policy-on-the-governance-of-good-research-practice/>

⁵ <https://ukrio.org/publications/code-of-practice-for-research/>

⁶ <https://ukrio.org/wp-content/uploads/UKRIO-Procedure-for-the-Investigation-of-Misconduct-in-Research-V2.pdf>

⁷ <https://allea.org/code-of-conduct/>

II Principles

7. All LSE staff and students (and any non-LSE staff undertaking research on behalf of LSE or using LSE facilities) are expected to observe the highest standards of integrity, honesty and professionalism and to embed good practice in every aspect of their work. This includes the interpretation and presentation of research results and contributions to the peer review process and the training of new researchers, staff and students as well as the conduct of the research itself. Research is deemed to follow good practice if it is conducted and disseminated in accordance with the **principles of honesty, accountability, transparency, research rigour and good stewardship**, in keeping with the School's Ethics Code and Research Ethics Policy.
8. In addition, specific requirements for good practice in research include:
 - Robust and appropriate research design
 - Documenting of methods and outcomes
 - Honesty in the reporting of findings
 - Acknowledging the contribution of others, whether they be researchers, funders or other stakeholders
 - Honesty and fairness with respect to the attribution of authors of any research outputs. This should include appropriate recognition of the work of research students or other researchers who have contributed to the research and/or publication. (It is recommended that researchers refer to the guidance on authorship provided by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE), the relevant sections of which are provided in Annex C of this document.)
 - Honesty in the citing of others' research and also of one's own previous relevant or similar research
 - Acknowledging the funders of the research in any research outputs
 - Transparency in reporting any impartiality or conflicts of interest of the researchers or other stakeholders involved in the research
 - Conducting the research in line with the LSE Research Ethics Policy and any other relevant ethical standards
 - Responsible data management, including the effective storing and archiving of data in accordance with relevant standards and policies, including those of Open Access. (For guidance see the LSE guidance on research data management⁸.)
 - Responsible use of research funds
 - Responsibility for the needs and training of early career researchers

Researchers may find it useful to refer to the UKRIO 'Recommended Checklist for researchers' when designing, conducting and disseminating their work.⁹

⁸ <https://www.lse.ac.uk/library/research-support/research-data-management-and-open-data>

⁹ <https://ukrio.org/wp-content/uploads/UKRIO-Recommended-Checklist-for-Researchers.pdf>

9. **Unacceptable conduct** includes the following (the list is not exhaustive):

- **Fabrication, falsification, fraud:** This includes the creation of false data or other aspects of research, including documentation and participant consent; the inappropriate manipulation and/or selection of data, imagery and/or consents; any other kind of fraudulent behaviour.
- **Plagiarism:** This includes the copying or misappropriation of ideas (or their expression), text, software, or data (or some combination thereof) without permission and due acknowledgement. Researchers are strongly encouraged to agree and record in advance with any co-authors and research assistants how any work carried out by them will be attributed in publications.
Self-plagiarism, or text recycling, (i.e. “presenting one’s own previously published work as though it were new”¹⁰) while not considered to be misconduct is deemed poor practice in all but limited circumstances¹¹. However, researchers should refrain from excessive text recycling without due reference.
- **Misrepresentation:** this includes:
 - (i) Misrepresentation of data, for example suppression of relevant findings and/or data, or knowingly, recklessly or by gross negligence, presenting a flawed interpretation of data;
 - (ii) Undisclosed duplication of publication, including undisclosed duplicate submission of manuscripts for publication;
 - (iii) Misrepresentation of interests, including failure to declare material interests either of the researcher or of the funders of the research, including failure to disclose the fact that research has been funded by the subject or commissioner of the research;
 - (iv) Misrepresentation of qualifications and/or experience, including claiming or implying qualifications or experience which are not held;
 - (v) Misrepresentation of involvement, such as inappropriate claims to authorship and/or attribution of work where there has been no significant contribution, or the denial of authorship or full acknowledgement where another researcher or author has made a significant contribution.
- **Mismanagement or inadequate preservation of data and/or primary materials.** This includes failure to:
 - (i) Keep clear and accurate records of the research procedures followed and the results obtained, including interim results;
 - (ii) Hold records securely in paper or electronic form;
 - (iii) Make relevant primary data and research evidence accessible to others for reasonable periods after the completion of the research: data should normally be preserved and accessible for seven years, but for projects of clinical or major social, environmental or heritage importance, for 20 years or longer;

¹⁰ American Psychological Association (2010) *The Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*. Sixth Edition, p.170

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p.16

- (iv) Manage data according to the research funder's data policy and all relevant legislation;
- (v) Wherever possible, deposit data permanently within a national repository/ data archive. Responsibility for proper management and preservation of data and primary materials is shared between the researcher and the research organisation.

- **Breach of duty of care**, which may involve but not be limited to the following:

- (i) Deliberately, recklessly or by gross negligence: disclosing improperly the identity of individuals or groups involved in research without their consent, or other breach of confidentiality; placing any of those involved in research in danger, whether as subjects, participants or associated individuals, without their prior consent, and without appropriate safeguards even with consent; this includes reputational danger where that can be anticipated;
- (ii) Not taking all reasonable care to ensure that the risks and dangers, the broad objectives and the sponsors of the research are known to participants or their legal representatives;
- (iii) Failing to ensure appropriate informed consent is obtained properly, explicitly and transparently;
- (iv) Not observing legal and reasonable ethical requirements including those of the LSE's Research Ethics Policy;
- (v) Improper conduct in peer review of research proposals or results (including manuscripts submitted for publication); this includes failure to disclose conflicts of interest; inadequate disclosure of clearly limited competence; misappropriation of the content of material provided for the purposes of peer review; breach of confidentiality or abuse of material provided in confidence for peer review purposes.

- **Collusion** by the deliberate participation in the research misconduct of another person, or concealment of such action by others.
- **Interference** by the intentional damage to, withholding or removal of, the research-related property of another person.
- **Negligence** by the culpable serious departure from contemporary legal, institutional and ethical practices in research, including unjustifiable departure from accepted practices, procedures and protocols.
- **Failure to declare or resolve a conflict of personal interest** in research, including failure to disclose the source of funding for the research where the funder has an interest in the outcome of the research.
- **Proprietary practices** such as the making of a vexatious allegation (or threat of allegation) of plagiarism for reasons other than the protection of academic integrity.
- **Breach of confidentiality** required by external research contractors.

10. Failure to comply with the School's Research Ethics Policy is deemed to be in breach of this Code of Research Conduct, as is failure to deal properly with allegations of misconduct.

III Upholding the Code

Responsibilities of researchers

11. All members of the School are under a general obligation to preserve and protect the integrity and probity of research and to uphold the principles of good research conduct as set out in section II above. Failure to uphold the Code of Research Conduct and the LSE Research Ethics Policy will be deemed to be research misconduct. If any member of the School has good reason to suspect any research misconduct, they should report their suspicions as prescribed below. Staff and students may, in the first instance, raise any concerns with the Principal Investigator of their research project, their mentor, Head of Department or supervisor as appropriate. In line with the School's Whistle-blowing (Public Interest Disclosure) policy (see Annex A), anyone making such an allegation will be protected from any type of punitive action, provided the disclosure is made in good faith. However, members of the School should bear in mind that an allegation of academic impropriety is serious and potentially defamatory, and if made maliciously could lead to the threat (or even the instigation) of legal proceedings.
12. There is a distinction between poor practices, such as weak record-keeping, which can be corrected or prevented by training, and unacceptable types of research misconduct such as those highlighted in §9 above. Minor infractions, where there is no evident intention to deceive, may be addressed informally through mentoring, education and guidance.
13. Researchers should comply with the School's policies and procedures on researcher safety and work with the relevant professional services divisions to enable the School to exercise its duty of care with respect to their safety.

Responsibilities of the School

14. As per §11 above, individuals are responsible for ensuring compliance with the Code. However, Departments, Institutes and Research Centres are responsible for promoting standards of good research conduct and ensuring that all staff and students receive appropriate training in standards of research conduct and research ethics as appropriate to their research. The School undertakes to provide the appropriate environment to promote good research conduct and will endeavour to underpin all of its work with the highest standards of ethics and integrity and to ensure that research is conducted in accordance with the principles of independence, rigour, objectivity, fairness and professionalism. The School also undertakes to ensure that transparent, robust and fair processes are in place to handle allegations of misconduct fairly and effectively.

15. The School will monitor, and where necessary improve, the suitability and appropriateness of the mechanisms in place to provide assurances over the ethics and integrity of research conducted by those subject to this Code.
16. The School supports the Russell Group 'Statement of Cooperation in respect of cross-institutional research misconduct allegations'¹², which sets out the desired standards for cross-institutional investigations between Russell Group members and other universities and/or research organisations (including those outside the UK).
17. Where an allegation of research misconduct has already been investigated by an academic journal, the School may still conduct its own investigation, since the aims of a journal investigation and a university investigation are not always fully aligned. Nevertheless, in some cases the results of a journal investigation may help inform and expedite an investigation by the School. Any decision to draw on the findings of a journal investigation, however, will be made on a case by case basis.

IV Procedures for the investigation of allegations of research misconduct

18. Allegations of research misconduct may be brought to the attention of the School by any individual, whether internal or external to the School, following the procedures set out in this Code.
19. The School does not set a time limit on when allegations can be raised, recognising that those raising concerns may have valid reasons for not raising concerns promptly. Each case will be considered on its merits, including the likelihood of finding sufficient evidence to establish the truth of the matter a significant time afterward, balanced with the responsibility to correct the record of research if appropriate.
20. The following principles will underpin the investigation of allegations:
 - Investigation is a neutral act to establish whether it is necessary to invoke formal disciplinary procedures.
 - Any investigation will be carried out as fully, fairly and expeditiously as possible. The timescale may, however, vary according to the time required to investigate a specific allegation.
 - Confidentiality will be maintained throughout the investigatory stage.
 - Where applicable, any investigation will take into account established disciplinary norms.
 - No-one making an allegation of misconduct in research in good faith will be victimised for having made an allegation.
 - However, it is recognised that the School must protect staff from allegations which are mischievous, frivolous and malicious or reckless or wholly without substance;

¹² <https://russellgroup.ac.uk/policy/policy-documents/research-integrity-statement-of-cooperation/>

appropriate action will be taken against any person who is found to have made a malicious or reckless allegation.

- Researchers who are found not to have committed research misconduct will be supported and appropriate steps taken to restore their reputation and that of any relevant research project(s).
- A member of staff against whom an allegation of misconduct is formally made and investigated will be given full details of the allegation.

21. Where an allegation concerns research conducted by a taught student, the case may be referred to the relevant Department to be investigated in line with the School Assessment Regulations.¹³
22. In order to uphold the reputation of the School, and to protect the interests of any relevant funding bodies or publishers, investigations of research misconduct will not be terminated on account of the member of staff or student under investigation leaving the School. Staff and students who have left the institution will be invited to continue to participate. Should they choose not to, the School may continue to consider the allegations against them in their absence.
23. This procedure will be followed for allegations of research misconduct received in the context of the School's Whistleblowing (Public Interest Disclosure) Policy¹⁴.
24. Any conflicts of interest will be avoided. Those who have any personal interest, real or perceived, in the allegation will be disqualified from acting as Screener or undertaking any other role in the investigation.
25. The following **definitions** apply for the purposes of this Policy:

Research: This policy adopts the definition used by the Funding Councils for REF2021 "...research is defined as a process of investigation leading to new insights, effectively shared. It includes work of direct relevance to the needs of commerce, industry, and to the public and voluntary sectors; scholarship; the invention and generation of ideas, images, performances, artefacts including design, where these lead to new or substantially improved insights; and the use of existing knowledge in experimental development to produce new or substantially improved materials, devices, products and processes, including design and construction. It excludes routine testing and routine analysis of materials, components and processes such as for the maintenance of national standards, as distinct from the development of new analytical techniques. It also excludes the development of teaching materials that do not embody original research."

Research misconduct: This policy uses the definition of research misconduct adopted by the Concordat to Support Research Integrity, namely: 'research misconduct is characterised as behaviours or actions that fall short of the standards of ethics, research and scholarship required to ensure that the integrity of research is upheld. It can cause harm to people and the environment, wastes resources, undermines the research record and damages the credibility of research. The [School] recognises that academic freedom is fundamental to the production of excellent research. This means that responsibility

¹³ <https://info.lse.ac.uk/current-students/services/assessment-and-results/exams/exam-discipline-and-academic-misconduct>

¹⁴ See <https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/lsePubIntDisPro.pdf>

for ensuring that no misconduct occurs rests primarily with individual researchers.' Examples of unacceptable conduct are given in §9 and 10 above.

Complainant: The person, or persons, bringing an allegation of research misconduct. The Complainant may or may not be a member of the School.

Named Person: The individual nominated by LSE to have responsibility for receiving allegations of research misconduct. They will initiate and supervise the procedure for investigating allegations of research misconduct and be responsible for decisions at key stages of the procedure. At LSE the Named Person is the **School Secretary**. In the case of any conflicts of interest a nominated alternate will carry out this role. This will be a nominated ex-Head of Department or a previous Chair of Research Ethics Committee.

Respondent: The person, or persons, against whom the allegation of research misconduct is made.

Screener: An independent scholar nominated to investigate the allegation and advise the School Secretary whether or not there is substance to the case. The Screener may be someone internal or external to the School.

Preliminary steps¹⁵

26. The purpose of the Receipt of Allegations Stage is to assess an allegation of research misconduct that has been received by the School, to determine the most appropriate process to investigate or otherwise address it. The primary aim is to determine whether the matter falls under the institutional procedure for investigating misconduct in research (in terms of both the matter raised and the individuals identified). Its aim is NOT to investigate the substance of the matter raised.
27. An allegation of research misconduct must be made in writing, supported by a detailed written statement substantiating the allegation, to the School Secretary (the Named Person) via the email address research.conduct@lse.ac.uk. The School Secretary (supported by the Research Governance Manager) will formally acknowledge receipt of the allegation in writing to the Complainant and advise him/her of the Procedure that will be followed.¹⁶
28. The identity of the Complainant shall be kept confidential. Exceptionally, if the School Secretary judges that revelation of the identity of the Complainant is essential to the fairness of the proceedings, then the Complainant will be asked to agree to the disclosure of his/her identity, or to withdraw the allegation.
29. The School Secretary will also determine whether the allegation and/or the research project(s) in question concern situations that require immediate action – for instance, to prevent further risk or harm to staff, participants or other persons. If so, the School Secretary will take immediate appropriate action to ensure that any such potential or actual danger/illegal activity/risk is prevented/ eliminated. It may be necessary to notify legal or regulatory authorities or relevant professional bodies. [It may be necessary to inform the Respondent when carrying out any such actions. This may be because the

¹⁵ A flowchart of the procedure can be found in Annex B

¹⁶ Throughout the process, the Research Governance Manager will record all decisions, and, where appropriate, undertake any relevant correspondence, etc.

Respondent will be involved in some or all of the actions and/or because the Respondent will become aware of them. (If it is necessary to inform the Respondent, they should at the same time be informed that an allegation of research misconduct has been made concerning them, that the allegation is being investigated under this Procedure, and that the matter is at the 'Receipt of allegations' stage.)] At all times, the Named Person will emphasise to all parties that the allegation is to be investigated, is as yet unproven and that the information is confidential.

30. The School Secretary will review the nature of the allegation and assess whether the case warrants further investigation (i.e. whether the complaint falls within the definition of research misconduct as outlined above). This should be completed within 10 working days of receipt of the allegation. In making this assessment the School Secretary may consult with one or all of the following as necessary: the Chair of the Research Ethics Committee, the Research Governance Manager, the Research Policy Manager, the Director of Research and Innovation. Furthermore, where deemed necessary, the School Secretary shall be free to seek confidential advice from persons with relevant expertise, either within the LSE or externally. Any of the above persons asked to provide such support should confirm to the School Secretary in writing that their participation involves no conflict of interest and that they will respect the confidentiality of the proceedings.
31. The purpose of the above assessment is not to determine whether the allegation should be upheld or dismissed, but to determine the most appropriate process to address an allegation.
32. The School Secretary may determine that the allegation falls within the scope of another formal process of the School and warrants referral directly to it, including but not limited to examination regulations, academic misconduct process or equivalent; bullying/harassment procedures or equivalent; financial fraud investigation process or other equivalent disciplinary process.
33. The School Secretary may decide that it is necessary to contact the Complainant and/or the Respondent to seek information or ask questions in order to carry out the above assessment. As per §29 above, if it is necessary to contact the Respondent, they should at the same time be informed that an allegation of research misconduct has been made concerning them, that the allegation is being investigated under this Procedure, and that the matter is at the 'Receipt of allegations' stage.
34. If the School Secretary deems that the allegation is not serious or may be the result of a misunderstanding or dispute between individuals, attempts will be made to resolve the situation by informal discussion, arbitration or dispute resolution.
35. If the School Secretary determines that the allegation is mistaken or malicious, the allegations will be dismissed, and this will be communicated in writing to the Complainant (and any other party who had been informed initially of the allegation), setting out the reasons why the allegation cannot be investigated under the Procedure.
36. If the School Secretary determines that the allegation is vexatious, malicious or otherwise an abuse of process they may invoke appropriate disciplinary action against the Complainant, or legal action if the Complainant is not a member of the School.

37. Those who have made allegations in good faith will not be penalized.
38. If the School Secretary determines that the allegation cannot be discounted, the Respondent will be informed of the following (if this has not already taken place under §29 or §33 above):
- That an allegation of research misconduct has been made which involves them;
 - A summary of the allegation;
 - The procedures under which the allegation is to be investigated.
- The Respondent will be given the opportunity to respond to the allegations should they wish to. Where they do so, the School Secretary will review their response to the allegation and weigh this up in their assessment of whether the case warrants further investigation. However, any such response by the Respondent at this stage will not preclude them from making a fuller, more informed response at a later stage should the case proceed to an investigation stage.
39. Following the response from the Respondent, if the School Secretary determines that the allegation still cannot be discounted, he/she will initiate the Initial Investigation stage.
40. Where he/she deems necessary, the School Secretary will inform relevant organisational contacts of the allegation received and the conclusion of this stage. Such contacts may include, but not be limited to: the relevant Head of Department or Research Centre Director, the directors of Human Resources, Research and Innovation, Finance Division. Any such communications will emphasize that the allegations are as yet unproven and that the information is confidential.

Screening Stage

41. Where the School Secretary has determined that the allegation cannot be discounted, a Screener will be appointed to investigate the allegation and determine whether there is substance to the case. In exceptional circumstances, for instance where an allegation involves multiple disciplines of research and/or is especially complex, the School Secretary may appoint a panel consisting of two or three persons (rather than an individual Screener). The panel may include external members, and will have a nominated Chair.¹⁷
42. The Screener may collect relevant documentary evidence from the Complainant and the Respondent. This may include, but will not be limited to, research notebooks, papers, witness statements and computer records. If necessary, the Screener may seek advice in writing from experts both within the School and outside, however this should first be discussed and agreed with the School Secretary.
43. Within 30 working days of appointment of the Screener, the Screener will submit a confidential written report to the School Secretary, together with any documentation collected during the investigation from the Complainant, Respondent or others. In their report, the Screener will provide their academic judgement as to whether:
- i) The allegation has no substance (or that there is insufficient evidence to support

¹⁷ Henceforth in this Procedure, reference to the 'Screener' shall be taken as reference to the screening panel where such a panel is appointed.

the allegation); or:

ii) The allegation has substance.

44. The School Secretary will review the advice and findings of the Screener and will decide:
 - i) That the allegation has no, or insufficient, substance and is dismissed, or:
 - ii) That the allegation has substance but may be dealt with under informal procedures, or:
 - iii) That the allegation has substance and a formal investigation should take place in accordance with the relevant disciplinary regulations (as set out in the Respondent's Terms and Conditions of employment).
45. The School Secretary will notify both the Complainant and the Respondent in writing of his/her decision within 30 working days of receipt of the advice and findings of the Screener.
46. As per §36 above, if the School Secretary decides that the allegation is vexatious, malicious or otherwise an abuse of process then the School Secretary may invoke appropriate disciplinary proceedings against the Complainant, or legal action if the Complainant is not a member of the School.
47. As per §37, those who have made allegations in good faith will not be penalized.

Formal investigation

48. As per §44 (iii) above, where the School Secretary has decided that an allegation has substance and that a formal investigation is appropriate, such an investigation will be undertaken in accordance with the relevant disciplinary regulations (as set out in the Respondent's Terms and Conditions of Employment). To avoid duplication, evidence gathered as part of the screening conducted under this Code of Research Conduct may be used in the subsequent formal investigation and in the course of any disciplinary proceedings, as appropriate.
49. In accordance with the current requirements of UKRI, where the Respondent is currently funded by UKRI (either for the research in question or other research) LSE will be required to inform the relevant Council. However, only anonymised data will be provided to the UKRI, unless the School Secretary deems that the nature of the allegation is sufficiently serious – for instance where there is a risk of harm to others – that identifiable information should be provided, in confidence, to UKRI.

Reporting and records management

50. The School Secretary will ensure that appropriate administrative action is taken as necessary to protect the interests of any relevant funding bodies or publishers and to meet all contractual obligations.
51. An anonymised report on allegations of research misconduct and their outcome, where appropriate, will be submitted annually to the LSE Research Committee and to Council, along with an annual Integrity Statement, following the recommendations of the UUK Concordat to Support Research Integrity¹⁸. The annual Integrity Statement will be made publicly available on the LSE 'Research and Integrity' webpage¹⁹.
52. LSE is also required to complete an annual report to the US Office of Research Integrity (ORI) to declare any allegations of research misconduct relating to research funded by the US Public Health Service²⁰.
53. All documents relating to the investigation must be collected and forwarded to the Research Governance Manager to be filed for a period of six years plus current year from the conclusion of a case. The data will be kept securely and in accordance with the rights of the data subjects.

Appeals

54. Details forthcoming – expected 2024

¹⁸ <https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/topics/research-and-innovation/concordat-support-research-integrity>

¹⁹ <https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/divisions/research-and-innovation/research/Research-integrity-at-LSE>

²⁰ As per the LSE Statement on Dealing with Allegations of Research Misconduct Under United States Public Health Service (USPHS) Research-related Activities for Foreign Institutions: <https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/divisions/research-and-innovation/research/Assets/Documents/PDF/ori-foreign-statement-lse.pdf>

Annex A: School and external resources

1. LSE Resources

Academic Annex. The Academic Annex can be found at:

<https://www.lse.ac.uk/intranet/staff/humanResources/internal/pdf/academicAnnex.pdf>

Data protection policy. The policy can be found at:

<http://www.lse.ac.uk/intranet/LSEServices/policies/pdfs/school/datProPol.pdf>

And guidance regarding the Data Protection and Research is at:

<http://www.lse.ac.uk/intranet/LSEServices/policies/pdfs/school/datProRes.pdf>

Data Security policies, procedures and guidelines. Please refer to the guidance and links at:

<http://www.lse.ac.uk/intranet/LSEServices/IMT/about/policies/home.aspx>

Ethics Code: A set of six core principles underpinning life at the LSE. All members of the LSE community, including students, staff, visiting appointments and governors, are expected to behave in line with these principles.

<http://www2.lse.ac.uk/intranet/LSEServices/ethics/home.aspx>

Health and Safety, travel and field work (School policies and legislation): Information on the measures that the School is taking to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of everyone who works, studies or visits the premises or may be affected by the activities of the School, as well as those undertaking fieldwork, can be found at:

<http://www2.lse.ac.uk/intranet/LSEServices/healthAndSafety/Home.aspx>

See also Researcher Safety guidance below.

Intellectual Property. The policy can be found at:

<https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/IntProPol.pdf>

Research Data Management: Guidance can be found at:

<http://www.lse.ac.uk/library/usingTheLibrary/academicSupport/RDM/home.aspx>.

Research Ethics Policy and Guidelines: Details of the School's Research Ethics Policy and procedures can be found at:

<http://www2.lse.ac.uk/intranet/researchAndDevelopment/researchPolicy/ethicsGuidanceAndForms.aspx>

Researcher Safety Policy and Guidance: For any issues concerning safety please contact:

Health.And.Safety@lse.ac.uk

Whistleblowing Policy (Public Interest Disclosure). See:

<http://www.lse.ac.uk/intranet/LSEServices/policies/pdfs/school/lsePubIntDisPro.pdf>

2. External resources

UUK Concordat to support research integrity

<https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/topics/research-and-innovation/concordat-support-research-integrity>

RCUK Policy and Guidelines on the Governance of Good Research Conduct

<http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/RCUK-prod/assets/documents/reviews/grc/RCUKPolicyandGuidelinesonGovernanceofGoodResearchPracticeFebruary2013.pdf>

UKRIO Code of Practice for Research: Promoting Good Practice and Preventing Misconduct

<https://ukrio.org/wp-content/uploads/UKRIO-Code-of-Practice-for-Research.pdf>

UKRIO Recommended Checklist for Researchers:

<https://ukrio.org/wp-content/uploads/UKRIO-Recommended-Checklist-for-Researchers.pdf>

Annex B: Flowchart of the procedure for the investigation of allegations of research misconduct

Allegation of research misconduct

- Made in writing to the Named Person (School Secretary) via research.conduct@lse.ac.uk

Preliminary steps

(to be completed within 10 working days)

- School Secretary to acknowledge allegation
- Action taken if required to prevent any further consequences/risks of the alleged misconduct
- School Secretary will assess whether the case warrants further investigation, i.e whether it falls within the definition of misconduct (§30);

Outcomes:

- School Secretary determines allegation does not warrant further investigation (e.g. may be due to a misunderstanding, or mistaken or malicious (§34, 35). **Allegation dismissed.** [Disciplinary action may be invoked against the Complainant if allegation deemed to be vexatious or malicious (§36)]
- School Secretary determines allegation cannot be discounted (§38, 39). Respondent informed of allegation & given opportunity to respond; School Secretary determines whether further investigation required. If yes, **proceeds to Screening stage.**

Screening Stage

(to be completed within 30 working days of appointment of the Screener)

- School Secretary appoints Screener to investigate the allegation and determine if there is substance to the case (§41)
- Screener to collect relevant evidence from both Complainant and Respondent (and others if appropriate)
- Screener submits a confidential report to the School Secretary with their judgement as to whether: i) allegation has no substance (or there is insufficient evidence to support it); or ii) allegation has substance (§43)

Outcomes

- School Secretary reviews the findings of the Screener and makes decision as to whether:
 - i) the allegation has no, or insufficient, substance and is dismissed (§44i), or:
 - ii) the allegation has substance but may be dealt with under informal procedures (44ii); or:
 - iii) That the allegation has substance and a formal investigation should take place (44iii)

Formal Investigation

In the case of 44iii, a formal investigation will be undertaken in accordance with the Academic Annex (staff or contract researchers) or the appropriate disciplinary regulations (in relation to other staff or students).

Annex C: Publication ethics

The following sections are from the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) guidance on authorship:²¹

The ICMJE recommends that authorship be based on the following 4 criteria:

- Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
- Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
- Final approval of the version to be published; AND
- Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

In addition to being accountable for the parts of the work he or she has done, an author should be able to identify which co-authors are responsible for specific other parts of the work. In addition, authors should have confidence in the integrity of the contributions of their co-authors.

All those designated as authors should meet all four criteria for authorship, and all who meet the four criteria should be identified as authors. Those who do not meet all four criteria should be acknowledged—see Section II.A.3 below. These authorship criteria are intended to reserve the status of authorship for those who deserve credit and can take responsibility for the work. The criteria are not intended for use as a means to disqualify colleagues from authorship who otherwise meet authorship criteria by denying them the opportunity to meet criterion #s 2 or 3. Therefore, all individuals who meet the first criterion should have the opportunity to participate in the review, drafting, and final approval of the manuscript.

The individuals who conduct the work are responsible for identifying who meets these criteria and ideally should do so when planning the work, making modifications as appropriate as the work progresses. It is the collective responsibility of the authors, not the journal to which the work is submitted, to determine that all people named as authors meet all four criteria; it is not the role of journal editors to determine who qualifies or does not qualify for authorship or to arbitrate authorship conflicts. If agreement cannot be reached about who qualifies for authorship, the institution(s) where the work was performed, not the journal editor, should be asked to investigate. If authors request removal or addition of an author after manuscript submission or publication, journal editors should seek an explanation and signed statement of agreement for the requested change from all listed authors and from the author to be removed or added.

[...]

Contributors who meet fewer than all 4 of the above criteria for authorship should not be listed as authors, but they should be acknowledged. Examples of activities that alone (without other contributions) do not qualify a contributor for authorship are acquisition of funding; general supervision of a research group or general administrative support; and writing assistance, technical editing, language editing, and proofreading. Those whose contributions do not justify authorship may be acknowledged individually or together as a group under a single heading (e.g. "Clinical Investigators" or "Participating Investigators"), and their contributions should be specified (e.g., "served as scientific advisors," "critically reviewed the study proposal," "collected data," "provided and cared for study patients", "participated in writing or technical editing of the manuscript").

Because acknowledgment may imply endorsement by acknowledged individuals of a study's data and conclusions, editors are advised to require that the corresponding author obtain written

²¹ <http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html>

permission to be acknowledged from all acknowledged individuals.

Review schedule

Review interval	Next review due by	Next review start
3 years	AY 2025-26	September 2025

Version history

Version	Date	Approved by	Notes
v13	September 2016	Chair RC, Oct 16; VCAB Jan 17	
v14 (c)	November 2017	RC, Oct 17; VCAB, Nov 17;	Due to changes in RCUK policy, Apr 17
v15	July 2018	RC, June 2018; VCAB July 2018.	Reference (§16) to RGIF Statement of Cooperation
v16	July 2019	Chair RC, July 2019	Minor correction and addition to Annex C
v17	October 2020	Research Committee, June 2020	Change of terminology: 'Preliminary Investigation' to 'Preliminary Steps'
v17b	January 2021	Chair RC, 06.01.21	Change of contact email to research.conduct@lse.ac.uk
v18	November 2021	Chair RC, 17.11.21	Bullet point addition to §9; minor wording changes to §21 and §25
v19	March 2023	RC, 30 March 2023	Review and revision, mostly of Part IV Minor edits by HR re references to Terms and Conditions, Nov 2023

Contacts

Position	Name	Email	Notes
Research Governance Manager	Lyn Grove	l.grove@lse.ac.uk	Author

Communications and Training

Will this document be publicised through Internal Communications?	Yes/ No
Will training needs arise from this policy	Yes/ No
If Yes, please give details	