

Good research practice - what is it ?

Engineering, Electricity, Materials
group

Good research practice - what is it ?

- A good and useful publication
- Describe existing systems of rules and encourage a more basic discussion about the ethical principles that are applied in research

General rules

- 1 Tell the truth about your research
- 2 Openly report your methods and results
- 3 Openly disclose any commercial interests and other ties
- 4 Consciously examine and present the basic assumptions underlying your studies
- 5 Do not steal research results from others
- 6 Conduct your research in an orderly manner
- 7 Do not conduct your research in a way that could harm other people
- 8 Be fair in your assessment of other people's research

- These requirements can be summed up in words like
- Honesty (1, 5),
- Openness (2–4),
- Orderliness (6),
- Consideration (7)
- Impartiality (8).

■ The rules enumerated here may seem general and applicable to all areas of research, and perhaps appear self-evident, their relative importance is not self-evident.

Exaggerating the application

Exaggerating the resources needed in an application, since the sum you get will probably be reduced anyway.

Have own experience from this:
I have (honestly) based my applications on the exact resources I need and every time it has been cut down.

So, then it is tempting to exaggerate to get the sum I need.
This gives a rather strange culture where the applicant and reviewer don't trust each other.

You should always be honest?
You should be happy with what you get? "Seller's market"

Does anyone have the same experience?

Old merits vs. new "better" ideas

"What would you do in the following situation? As a journal editor, you have received a manuscript from a very well-known, older researcher. You see that he has published over 50 articles in your journal, long before you became its editor, and that many of them are now classics. But his new article seems to be mostly a rehash of old material, and what is more is quite poorly structured. The referee recommends rejection. You are considering giving him special treatment by going through his paper carefully and suggesting a number of specific changes, although even then you hardly expect the result to be very good."

Own experience from an Ocean energy conference held by us in Uppsala

Where a:

- Highly respected, experienced and charismatic old researcher in the field
- Submitted a low quality paper that was accepted (only based on his former merits and status...?)

That could lead to:

- Decrease the scientific level of the conference and the scientific community
- Jeopardizing the credibility of the steering committee of the conference
- Take space from younger researchers with papers with higher quality
- The conference would benefit from the participation of this charismatic and experienced researcher, and he would maybe not attend if he was rejected

Reject or not?

Who should be on the paper?

- Former colleague who wrote a part of the code you use?
- Colleague who built the experimental set up?

Does it matter how many author's there are on the paper?

- Put everyone involved on the paper not offend anyone..
- Takes credit from the first author who has done 90 % of the work..

Should every author on the paper be able to describe the context of the paper?

- Difficult if the paper is interdisciplinary

Scenario: You came up with an idea for a paper that you write with a colleague, but in the end you realize that he/she has made the major part of the work. Who should be first author?
