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Our dilemma

For far too long now, in your applications to the research council and at various international conferences, you have been talking about a major work that is soon to be finished, and of which you are rightly proud. Now you are finally going to publish it – and not before time, because you have heard that a group in Hamburg has a similar publication in the pipeline. Then one of your colleagues discovers an irritating error in one of your computer programs. Probably it is of no significance, but it will take at least six months to fully investigate the consequences. If your work is not published before the next application round, or the Germans beat you to it, the livelihoods of a postdoc scholarship holder and a postdoctoral research fellow funded from you council grant will be put in jeopardy.
Problem

- Problem owner: the researcher

- Should the researcher publish the work?
Potential Solutions

1. do not publish until correct the bugs
2. publish
3. partly publish
4. publish and mention the bugs
5. publish on open access websites, e.g. arXiv
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Effect of groups

§ The research groups
  • E.g. the authors involved
  • E.g. the research group

§ Competing German research group
  • E.g. beating them in publication

§ Research council
  • E.g. grant funding

§ Postdoc scholarship
  E.g. Not exist
Questions posed

- Does this affect researchers reputation in research community?

- Are you publishing incorrect results? Issues in making incomplete findings before going through peer-review process?

- Publish or Perish?
What do you think?
## Values and Attitudes involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Values</strong></th>
<th><strong>Attitudes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our solution</strong></td>
<td>+probably publication +probably research grant</td>
<td>+Honesty +Accuracy +Trusty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solution 2</strong></td>
<td>+probably publication +probably research grant</td>
<td>-Honesty -Accuracy -Trusty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solution 4</strong></td>
<td>+probably publication +probably research grant</td>
<td>+Honesty +Accuracy +Trusty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solution 1</strong></td>
<td>-no publication -no research grant</td>
<td>+Honesty +professioncy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

- Used OLE as guidelines

- What goes around comes around
  (Loss and gain)

- There is no optimal solution, just do a right thing !!