



## Special Interest Event: Code of Conduct and Ethics in Science

5 July 2016, 12:00-13:45

FENS Forum 2016, Copenhagen, Denmark

The aim of the meeting is to jointly discuss and explore through thought-provoking presentations a number of scientific conduct aspects. We have selected four topics for the meeting and each will be introduced briefly followed by a discussion. We expect to raise interesting and vivid discussion in the audience, and hope that participants will be willing to share their own experiences and opinions.

### Programme

- 12:00-12:05 **Welcome Address/Introductory note** 5'
- Barry Everitt, FENS President-Elect**  
University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
- 12:05- 12:28 **How to communicate with journalists?** 9' talk +14' Q&A
- Scientists encounter journalists infrequently. They sometimes have unrealistic ideas about what journalism actually is, and how it differs from straightforward science communication. This short session will elaborate the world of journalism and explain, with examples, how scientists can best interface with it. Scientific journalism is not rocket science – but it may be different from what you imagine.
- Alison Abbott, Senior European Correspondent**  
Nature, Germany
- 12:28-12:51 **Open access publishing** 9' talk +14' Q&A
- As scientists, we experience frustration when we cannot immediately download a paper to read due to lack of subscription. There is also mounting pressure from governments and other funders who support research to make papers available to everyone. However, the landscape of open access (OA) publishing and copyright of scientific articles is quite confusing. In this session, we will outline some of the issues surrounding OA publishing and will engage in a discussion of some of the questions surrounding open access publishing such as: Who is pushing scientists to publish open access? Where/how can I do this? and What are the benefits and risks of open access publishing for neuroscientists?
- Tara Spires-Jones, FENS-KAVLI Scholar**  
University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom





## 12:51- 13:14 **Plagiarism**

9' talk +14' Q&A

Plagiarism is considered dishonest and a breach of ethics. However, when is an author of a scientific paper guilty of plagiarism? According to some this is trivial, if an author 'steals' data or text from another, by publishing them as novel, owned by her/him, like copy a complete paper from author A and publish the paper using your own name as author. What if one copies a few sentences in the methods section and use them? Or, what if I copy parts of my own paper into the next one, and what if I copy only (parts of) my own method section; after all there are only a few ways to write a methodological section in a short and efficient way. Can one reuse a figure from one's paper in for example a chapter in a book or a monograph? If I have submitted my doctoral thesis that consists of manuscripts and upon acceptance will be published as a complete work by my university, can I still publish the individual chapters as papers in a scientific journal or is that considered plagiarism? All these questions indicate that what may seem a simple question, in fact might be more complicated. In this part of the meeting, a professional, dealing with these issues will use some examples in line with the questions outlined here, to stimulate a discussion among the participants aiming to explore where acceptable conduct changes into misconduct.

**Paul Bolam, EJM Editors in Chief**

University of Oxford, United Kingdom

**John Foxe, EJM Editor in Chief**

University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, United States

## 13:14- 13:37 **Fabrication and falsification, from pure misconduct into the grey zone**

9' talk +14' Q&A

Worldwide there have been many examples of severe scientific misconduct. Most countries have their own special cases where fabrication, falsification or plagiarism has been the mean obtain particular scientific recognition, prestigious positions in society or personal financial gain. Clearly these cases shake the very core of science, because, we as scientist, have to trust and freely exchange scientific ideas and results in order to bring new concepts to the table. Moreover, scientific misconduct unsettles the basis of our funding and career development systems and hampers the scientists' reputation in society. The unravelling of the larger cases of scientific misconduct always make for a fascinating story and the entire community gasp unanimously in wonder of how one person with could take it this far. The question is, should we really wonder? Is science, as a discipline with severe competition, revealing the same sides of human psychology as the larger sports disciplines? As competition in science intensifies, are we just seeing our own share of doping cases?

In this part, we will discuss different degrees of scientific doping, the pros and cons of scientific competition, the grey zone and ethical borders for scientific conduct in manuscripts, presentations and application for funding.

**Lise Wogensen Bach, Vice-dean**





Faculty of Health Sciences, Aarhus University, Denmark

13:37-13:45 **Conclusions**

8'

**Barry Everitt, FENS President-Elect**

