



**CODE OF  
GOOD  
SCIENTIFIC  
PRACTICE**

---

CODE OF  
**GOOD  
SCIENTIFIC  
PRACTICE**

---



2014



# FAPESP

São Paulo Research Foundation

---

Celso Lafer

*President*

Eduardo Moacyr Krieger

*Vice-president*

## Board of Trustess

Celso Lafer

Eduardo Moacyr Krieger

Alejandro Szanto de Toledo

Fernando Ferreira Costa

Horacio Lafer Piva

João Grandino Rodas

José de Souza Martins

Maria José Soares Mendes Giannini

Marilza Vieira Cunha Rudge

Pedro Luiz Barreiros Passos

Suely Vilela

Yoshiaki Nakano

## Executive Board

José Arana Varela

*Chief Executive Officer*

Carlos Henrique de Brito Cruz

*Scientific Director*

Joaquim José de Camargo Engler

*Administrative Director*

Translation

*Kendra Johnson*

Translation of the letter

*Kim Olson*

Revision

*Nature Publishing Group Language Editing*

## Summary

1. Cover letter, 7
2. Preamble, 13
3. Guidelines for scientific activities, 19
  - 3.1. On the design, proposal and performance of research, 21
  - 3.2. On the presentation of research findings and authorship, 22
  - 3.3. On the recording, storage and accessibility of data and information, 24
  - 3.4. On potential conflicts of interest, 25
  - 3.5. On peer review, 25
  - 3.6. On mentoring, 27
4. On scientific misconduct, 29
5. On the responsibility of research institutions, 33
6. On the allegation, investigation and declaration of scientific misconduct, 37



**1**

Cover letter

---





## 1. Cover letter

Subject: Good Scientific Practices  
From: Scientific Directorate  
To: FAPESP Board of Trustees

In addition to the ethical principles to which all individuals are subject, regardless of the singularity of their professional activities, scientists are also held to standards of scientific conduct that derive from the specific purpose of their profession: the collective building and appropriation of science. These standards define the ethical integrity of scientific activities, and can be reduced to a single basic principle: all scientists must practice their profession in the most appropriate manner possible that enables them to make their best contribution to the advancement of science.

Any violation of this principle, either intentionally or due to negligence, compromises the trustworthiness of the results of scientific research, undermines the foundations of collaboration between researchers, and hampers the process of building science as a collective endeavor. Furthermore, compromising the public trust in science itself, undermines the very reason for its existence: to be an effective instrument for expanding human knowledge and the rational course of human actions, in their most varied forms.

Over the course of recent decades, international consensus has been reached on the issue of whether ethical integrity of scientific activities deserves continuous and systematic attention from the scientific community and the institutions through which they are organized. Consensus also holds that such research integrity should be regulated

by the community itself. Therefore, particularly over the last ten years, in many parts of the world, institutional policies have been formulated through regulations and codes of conduct that address the treatment of these issues, and institutional agencies charged with implementing these policies have been established.

Although the established consensus is that the principal responsibility for formulating and implementing these policies lies with the research institutions, it is also a consensus that co-responsibility lies with the research sponsoring agencies, as an inherent part of their mission in managing public resources for the purpose of promoting the advancement of science. By adhering to this consensus, FAPESP is now defining its policy of ethical research integrity by establishing a Code of Good Scientific Practices and taking measures designed to ensure the integrity of the research it supports.

The ultimate purpose for establishing this policy is to implement solid and deeply rooted ethical research integrity in the scientific community of the state of São Paulo. It undertakes to achieve this through a set of action strategies built upon three independent pillars:

- 1) education;
- 2) prevention;
- 3) fair and thorough investigation and sanction.

As specified in its Code of Good Scientific Practices, FAPESP will require the institutions that conduct the research it funds to maintain agencies that are obligated specifically to: (a) regularly promote educational activities, such as courses, events and professional development programs to train its researchers, that address the values and pertinent competencies involved in ethical research integrity; (b) offer researchers and students at the institutions advice on particular situations that involve the implementation of these values and the exercise of these competencies; (c) formally investigate and, if necessary, fairly and thoroughly punish, according to expressly defined rules, any report of scientific misconduct, while respecting the rights of the accused to obtain a full defense, the presumption of innocence,

and the preservation of his or her reputation during the course of the investigation.

For its part, FAPESP undertakes to ensure the appropriateness of the scientific activities it funds according to the values that define ethical research integrity, as well as contribute to the communication of these values. The potential effectiveness of the educational, preventive, investigative and punitive actions specified by the research institutions will be considered an essential component in evaluating the requests for grants and scholarships submitted by researchers at these institutions. Whenever FAPESP deems necessary, it will conduct independent investigations into reports of scientific misconduct. If any misconduct is found to have occurred with regard to the research it funds, FAPESP will take punitive and corrective measures against the authors of said misconduct, with regard to the scientific damages caused by it.

Moreover, FAPESP will promote educational activities designed to communicate the values of the ethical research integrity it espouses, such as by holding events and by publishing pertinent bibliographic materials on its website.

FAPESP is convinced that the combined efforts of researchers, research institutions and the Foundation itself will succeed in keeping scientific research in the state of São Paulo in compliance with the highest levels of ethical integrity.

September 5, 2011.

Scientific Directorate  
FAPESP



# 2

## Preamble

---



## 2. Preamble

This code establishes ethical guidelines for the scientific activities of FAPESP (São Paulo Research Foundation) research grant and fellowship beneficiaries and FAPESP advisors engaged in scientific evaluation. This code is also applicable to public or private institutions and organizations presenting themselves to FAPESP as seats of scientific activity (herein generically referred to as research institutions) and the scientific periodicals funded by FAPESP.

Scientific activity is herein understood to be any activity that directly aims to conceive and conduct scientific research, communicate the results thereof, encourage scientific interaction among researchers and mentor or supervise researchers in training processes.

Scientific research is herein understood to be any original investigation that aims to contribute to the constitution of a science. A science is understood to be any body of rationally systematized and justified knowledge obtained through the methodical use of observation, experimentation, and reasoning. This broad definition applies to the exact, natural and human sciences, technological disciplines and disciplines usually included among the so-called humanities.

The guidelines established in this code concern only a portion of scientists' professional ethical responsibilities. They solely concern the integrity of scientific research as such, i.e., the values and ethical standards of conduct that derive directly and specifically from the scientist's commitment to the purpose of his or her profession: the collective construction of science as a shared possession. On the presupposition that the scientific community should practice self-regulation and self-control in matters of research integrity, this Code



of Good Scientific Practice is intended to aid researchers in responding to the following questions as they arise: How should I conduct my research activities to make the best contribution to science? How should I conduct myself in relation to other researchers so that the scientific community functions and grows in the best possible manner?

Therefore, this document does not address innumerable important ethical aspects of scientific activity – i.e., those related to general ethical values rather than strictly scientific ones – that are already regulated by specific legal instruments and to which the research institutions must assure compliance. It is herein assumed as evident that all researchers and research institutions must consider these important aspects during the course of scientific activity. In particular, this code does not address questions of honesty in financial resource management or issues pertaining to bioethics –for example, issues that related to respecting the physical, psychological and moral integrity of experimental subjects, the appropriate treatment of animals used in research studies and the preservation of the environment and public health.

This Code of Good Scientific Practice does not presume to be exhaustive or automatically applicable. It formulates definitions and general guidelines that may require interpretation in light of the specific circumstances within which research is conducted and consideration of specific values arising from the distinctive aspects of different fields and modalities of scientific research. It presents, in sum, a minimal set of general precepts to be specified and added to by the various people and institutions involved in scientific research according to their conditions and needs. Experience has proven that this specification and complementation often requires an interpretive effort based on nontrivial scientific and nonscientific judgments. In this regard, the application of this Code presupposes that researchers and institutions are invariably attuned to matters of research integrity.

The establishment of this Code was aided by international experience with ethical integrity in scientific research that was accumulated over the last few decades. This experience has resulted in codes of conduct and policies and procedures manuals adopted by the leading international funding agencies. Among those, it is worth mentioning the policies and

procedures manuals of the United States National Science Foundation (see [www.nsf.gov/oig/resmisreg.pdf](http://www.nsf.gov/oig/resmisreg.pdf)) and National Institutes of Health (see [ori.dhhs.gov/documents/42\\_cfr\\_parts\\_50\\_and\\_93\\_2005.pdf](http://ori.dhhs.gov/documents/42_cfr_parts_50_and_93_2005.pdf)); the Research Councils UK code of conduct (see [www.rcuk.ac.uk/documents/reviews/grc/goodresearchconductcode.pdf](http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/documents/reviews/grc/goodresearchconductcode.pdf)); the Australian funding agencies code of conduct (see [www.nhmrc.gov.au/\\_files\\_nhmrc/publications/attachments/r39.pdf](http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/_files_nhmrc/publications/attachments/r39.pdf)); and the European Science Foundation code of conduct (see [www.esf.org/publications](http://www.esf.org/publications)).



# 3

## Guidelines for scientific activities

---



### 3. Guidelines for scientific activities

These guidelines are rooted in the general principle that every scientist is ethically responsible for advancing science. The scientist must exhibit *intellectual honesty*, *objectivity* and *impartiality*, *truthfulness*, *fairness* and *responsibility* in the conception, proposal or implementation of research activities, in the presentation of its results and in cooperation or training relationships with other researchers. The presumption that these values will prevail in research activity is inseparable from the presumption of the reliability of this activity's results, which is a necessary condition for the collective construction, appropriation and use of science.

The guidelines detailed below result from the application of these fundamental values to different dimensions of scientific activity:

#### 3.1. On the design, proposal and performance of research

3.1.1. In designing a research project and submitting a proposal to FAPESP for funding, the researcher must seek to offer an original and relevant contribution to advance science.

3.1.2. In designing a research project and submitting a proposal to FAPESP for funding, the researcher must believe that he or she has the scientific capacity to complete the project and the human and institutional resources for adequately executing the project.

3.1.3. In designing a research project and submitting a proposal to

FAPESP for funding, the researcher must explicitly and objectively detail the positive and negative factors that he or she believes might influence the evaluation of the project's originality, relevance and feasibility.

3.1.4. In designing a research project and submitting a proposal to FAPESP for funding, the researcher must declare any potential conflicts of interest (see Section 2.4 below) that might affect the scientific reliability of the project's results.

3.15. In designing a research project, the researcher must choose the procedures that he or she deems the most scientifically appropriate and must perform them in the manner that he or she deems the most scientifically appropriate to obtain the desired scientific ends.

3.16. In performing a research project in collaboration with other researchers or as a member of a team, the researcher must maintain the confidentiality of all data, information, procedures and partial results until the final results of the study are published, unless all collaborators and all team coordinators grant permission to disclose such information.

3.1.7. In submitting a research proposal to FAPESP for funding, the researcher must present true, complete and precise curricular information.

## **3.2. On the presentation of research findings and authorship**

3.2.1. When communicating the research findings by means of a scientific work, the researcher must accurately present the findings and all data, information and procedures that he or she deems to have been relevant to the scientific attainment and justification of the findings. If such disclosure is not possible for ethical or legal reasons, this fact should be expressly noted in the scientific work.

3.2.2. A scientific work that presents the results of research performed in a situation with potential conflicts of interest (see Section 2.4 below) should contain a clear, prominently placed statement of this conflict of interest. In general, the work should contain a clear indication of all sources of direct or indirect material support for the study's execution and dissemination.

3.2.3. It is supposed that every idea and every oral or written verbal formulation a scientific work contains that is not obviously of public domain in the respective research area is an original contribution of the work's authors. If this is not the case, the idea or formulation's authors must be clearly credited in the work, regardless of whether the idea or formulation has already been presented in a scientific work.

3.2.4 Any researcher that submits to a publishing vehicle a scientific work that is identical or substantially similar to a work that has been submitted to or already published by other vehicle should expressly inform the respective editors at the moment of submission.

3.2.5. Any researcher that publishes a scientific work that is identical or substantially similar to a work already published should clearly and prominently cite the first publication in the text of the work.

3.2.6. In a scientific work, authorship should include all and only researchers that have made direct and substantial intellectual contributions to the design or execution of research and have given their express permission to be included. Specifically, the provision of financial and infrastructural resources (e.g., laboratories, equipment, inputs, materials, human resources, institutional support) is not sufficient ground for being listed among the authors of the scientific works resulting from the research project.

3.2.7 Each of the authors of a scientific work is fully responsible for the scientific quality of the work in its entirety, unless the limits of his or her scientific contributions to the work's results are expressly and precisely defined.



### 3.3. On the recording, storage and accessibility of data and information

3.3.1. Researchers must precisely and completely record the data and information collected, the procedures utilized and any partial results obtained during the course of a research study.

3.3.2. Original research data should be securely stored for a substantial period after the study's results are published. The length of this period may vary according to the study's area and characteristics but should be a minimum of five years. The researchers and their research institutions share the responsibility for storing this information.

3.3.3. The records of research that has come under scrutiny for ethical or scientific correction should be stored until the issues in question have been completely settled.

3.3.4. After the results are published, the research records must be made available to other researchers who may want to verify the study's correctness or replicate or continue the study. Accessibility may only be limited for ethical or legal reasons.

### 3.4 On potential conflicts of interest

3.4.1. A potential conflict of interest occurs in situations in which the researcher's due interest in advancing science and interests of another nature, even legitimate ones, can be reasonably perceived as conflicting and prejudicial to the objectivity and impartiality of scientific decisions, regardless of the researcher's intent or knowledge thereof.

3.4.2. In these situations, based on the nature and gravity of the conflict, the researcher should consider his or her aptitude to make decisions and whether he or she should abstain from making them.

3.4.3. In cases in which the researcher is convinced that a potential conflict of interests will not jeopardize the objectivity and impartiality of his or her scientific decisions, the existence of the conflict should be clearly disclosed to all parties involved in these decisions immediately after these decisions have been made.

### 3.5. On peer review

3.5.1. All researchers accredited to receive FAPESP grants and fellowships must be willing to participate in the assessment of peers working in the same scientific field or a related area whenever requested by FAPESP, except when there is a potential conflict of interest or for reasons of force majeure.

3.5.2. Researchers participating in peer-review processes for funding requests, reports or matters of any other nature at FAPESP's request must do so in a precise, objective, impartial and timely manner.

3.5.3 When participating in FAPESP peer-review processes, the interest in providing expert scrutiny of the document in question should prevail over any other interests, even legitimate ones. Particularly, differences in scientific judgment should not be sufficient grounds for a negative review of the scientific merit of the document in question.

3.5.4 Participants in FAPESP peer-review processes must consider any potential conflicts of interest before proceeding with the requested assessment process. Peer reviewers must disclose any conflict of interest as soon as it becomes apparent, abstain from the process and notify FAPESP immediately. In the event of a doubt, the FAPESP's Scientific Director's Office should immediately be consulted.

3.5.5. FAPESP deems the following situations, among others, to indicate unequivocal conflicts of interest for peer reviewers:

- (a) Participating, having participated or intending to participate in the development of the research project or proposal submitted for evaluation.
- (b) Maintaining or having maintained regular scientific collaboration in research activities or publications with any of the researchers responsible for the proposal submitted for evaluation.
- (c) Maintaining or having maintained a mentor relationship (either orientation or supervision) with any of the researchers responsible for the proposal submitted for evaluation.
- (d) Having a commercial or financial interest in the development (or nondevelopment) of the proposal submitted for evaluation.
- (e) Having a family relationship with any one of the researchers responsible for the proposal submitted for evaluation.
- (f) Having or having had a relationship with any one of the researchers responsible for the proposal submitted for evaluation that can be reasonably perceived to jeopardize the objectivity or impartiality of the evaluation.

3.5.6 The identity of the author of a peer review requested by FAPESP should be kept confidential by both the author him/herself and FAPESP, unless both parties expressly agree otherwise. FAPESP will only agree to disclose the names of ad hoc advisers under unequivocally exceptional circumstances.

3.5.7. Participants in FAPESP peer review processes must act in confidence regarding any and all information made available during the evaluation process and must not take undue advantage of said knowledge for scientific or nonscientific gains without written consent from the authors of the proposals or documents evaluated. Any agreements in this regard must be established with FAPESP's express approval and intermediation.

3.5.8. Peer reviewers must notify FAPESP of any possible scientific misconduct, or any other ethically reprehensible procedure, that they become aware of over the course of the evaluation.

### 3.6. On mentoring

3.6.1. In accepting for the formal title of mentor (adviser or supervisor) of a researcher in training, the researcher must be certain that he or she has the appropriate qualifications, time and any other conditions necessary to perform this function well. When serving as a mentor, providing the mentee with the best scientific training takes precedence over interests of any other nature, even legitimate ones.

3.6.2. During the mentorship period, the mentor shares responsibility for the scientific and ethical quality of his or her mentees' research activities and reports of their results.

3.6.3. In addition to offering mentees appropriate scientific orientation and training, every mentor should motivate and facilitate mentee's participation in regular and systematic educational, training and orientation activities regarding research integrity issues. These activities, as well as frequent discussion of these issues with mentees, should be included in the planned activities for FAPESP fellows and constitute an important item in application assessments.

3.6.4. Mentors must guarantee that scientific contributions resulting from research activities they advise or supervise will always receive credit that is appropriate to the contributions' nature and significance.



# 4

## On scientific misconduct

---



## 4. On scientific misconduct

Misconduct is understood as any conduct by a researcher that intentionally or by negligence transgresses the values and principles that define the ethical integrity of scientific research and relationships among researchers, such as those set forth in this code. Scientific misconduct is not to be confused with an honest scientific error committed in good faith or honest differences in scientific judgment.

The seriousness of scientific misconduct is measured by the degree to which it involves a clear intention to defraud or a gross negligence, by how much it deviates from the practices consensually considered ethically acceptable by the scientific community and by how potentially damaging it may be to the reliability of the researchers and of science in general.

The most typical and frequent forms of serious misconduct are as follows:

- (a) *Fabrication*: the claim that data, procedures or results were obtained or conducted when in fact they were not.
- (b) *Falsification*: the presentation of data, procedures or results in such a modified, inaccurate or incomplete way as to interfere in the evaluation of the true scientific merit of the research findings.
- (c) *Plagiarism* or the use of another's ideas or verbal formulations, in an oral or written format, without express and clear credit to the authors, in a way that may reasonably generate the perception that the ideas or formulations are one's own.

4.1. No researcher should facilitate, by action or omission, the



occurrence or concealment of scientific misconduct. When in doubt, the researcher must seek counsel from the regulatory office within his or her institution or FAPESP.

**4.2.** All researchers must collaborate with the investigation of possible cases of scientific misconduct within their respective research institutions or FAPESP.

**4.3.** No researcher should practice or facilitate, by action or omission, any act that could reasonably be perceived as retaliatory against a person who reports possible scientific misconduct, in good faith, to a research institution or to FAPESP, or who collaborates with an investigation of scientific misconduct.

**4.4.** Deliberately or negligently providing false information about the occurrence of possible scientific misconduct is considered scientific misconduct.

# 5

## On the responsibility of research institutions

---



## 5. On the responsibility of research institutions

Research institutions share responsibility with individual researchers to preserve scientific integrity in research. They bear the primary responsibility for promoting a culture of good scientific conduct among researchers and students and for the prevention, investigation and punishment of scientific misconduct in their midst.

5.1. Every research institution must have clearly formulated policies and procedures to address research integrity issues.

5.2. Any institution that presents itself to FAPESP as a seat of research activity should include in its organizational chart one or more organs specifically tasked with (a) promoting a culture of research integrity through regular education, dissemination, counseling and training programs accessible to all researchers bonded to it and (b) investigating and, if necessary, punishing scientific misconduct and repairing any scientific damages that may have been caused.

5.3. All scientific periodicals should regularly utilize procedures to identify scientific misconduct during the evaluation processes for scientific works submitted for publication. FAPESP will consider the regular utilization of such procedures important criteria when evaluating requests for publication grants. If scientific misconduct is noted in research funded by FAPESP, the editors of the periodical should immediately notify FAPESP and the research institutions with which the authors are associated.

5.4. When scientific misconduct occurs and may have affected the scientific merit of a previously published work, the publishing vehicle should clearly and expressly report that fact in the immediately subsequent edition.



# 6

On the allegation,  
investigation and declaration  
of scientific misconduct

---



## 6. On the allegation, investigation and declaration of scientific misconduct

6.1. Because the ethical integrity of research is a matter of self-regulation and self-control by the scientific community, any researcher with well-founded belief that scientific misconduct has occurred in relation to FAPESP-funded research should, under ordinary circumstances, inform the institution within which the research was carried out of the misconduct. In extraordinary situations, they should inform FAPESP directly. An allegation of scientific misconduct is herein understood to be any and all information, no matter the means of transfer, about possible evidence of scientific misconduct.

6.2. All research institutions should formally define clear, fair and rigorous procedures for receiving and investigating allegations of scientific misconduct. A minimum set of guidelines to be followed in the case of allegations of scientific misconduct related to FAPESP-funded research is formulated within this code, in addition to any other precepts that may be established by the institution.

6.3. All research institutions should have an office exclusively responsible for receiving allegations of scientific misconduct related to research carried out at the institution, evaluating the level of their reliability and specificity and, if needed, initiating and coordinating the investigation of the alleged facts. This office will be referred to in this code as the responsible office.

6.4. Preliminary Evaluation. Upon receiving an allegation of scientific misconduct related to FAPESP-funded research, the responsible office shall begin a preliminary evaluation process to determine: (a) whether the definition of scientific misconduct applies to the alleged facts; (b) whether the allegation, perhaps together with other available or easily



accessed information, is reliable and specific enough to make credible the evidence that the alleged facts occurred and therefore justify initiating a formal investigation process.

6.4.1. Ordinarily, a preliminary evaluation process should take place within 30 days after the allegation is received.

6.4.2. A preliminary evaluation process should be conducted by one or more people formally appointed by the responsible office to carry it out. These people should have the specialized knowledge required by the nature of the allegation and should not have potential conflicts of interest that could be reasonably perceived to affect their impartiality in the evaluation.

6.4.3. If the alleged scientific misconduct is considered serious by the responsible office according to the criteria defined in Section 3 above, the preliminary evaluation process should be conducted by a committee of at least three people. All allegations of fabrication, falsification or plagiarism (as per the definitions formulated in Section 3 above) should be considered allegations of serious scientific misconduct.

6.4.4. At the end of the preliminary evaluation process, those conducting the process should present and justify the investigation's conclusions in a circumstantiated report.

6.4.5. If the preliminary evaluation finds it plausible that scientific misconduct has occurred, the responsible office should, under ordinary circumstances, inform those accused of the misconduct and FAPESP about the existence and nature of the allegation by sending them the preliminary evaluation report with its conclusions. A formal investigation of the alleged misconduct should then begin unless the respondent admits that the misconduct occurred and assumes full responsibility for it. In the case of such an admission, the declaration of its occurrence should be annexed to the preliminary evaluation report and sent immediately to FAPESP. In extraordinary situations, when immediately notifying the respondent could clearly harm the investigation process, notification may be delayed for the shortest

clearly justifiable period necessary.

6.4.6. In the case of serious misconduct allegations, independent of the preliminary evaluation process's conclusions, FAPESP should be informed of the existence and nature of the allegation, and it should receive a copy of the report by the commission conducting the evaluation.

6.4.7. In the case of alleged scientific misconduct that is not considered serious, if the preliminary evaluation concludes that the allegation substantially refers to disagreements between researchers or other physical or legal persons, the responsible office should seek to resolve these disagreements through mediation or arbitration. When an agreement is met, the case can be considered closed if there are no possible resulting losses to third parties. The responsible office should inform FAPESP about the existence and nature of the allegation and the solution to the disagreement.

**6.5. *Formal Investigation Process.*** A formal investigation of scientific misconduct serves to

- (a) Collect and evaluate the evidence and other substantiating elements, such as testimonials and technical statements from ad hoc consultants that may be relevant to establishing the degree of probability that the alleged misconduct occurred;
- (b) Determine, based on the balance of the probabilities, whether the evidence and other substantiating elements supporting the conclusion that the alleged misconduct did occur preponderate over the evidence to the contrary;
- (c) Determine, in the case that the evidence against the respondent does preponderate, the degree of seriousness of the misconduct and the respondent's degree of responsibility for it;
- (d) Suggest punitive and corrective measures to be taken by the research institution relative to the scientific damages the alleged misconduct has caused.

6.5.1. Under ordinary circumstances, a formal investigation should be conducted within a 90-day period beginning when the

preliminary evaluation process ends.

6.5.2. The respondent and FAPESP should both be notified immediately at the beginning of a formal investigation process. This notification is distinct from the notification prescribed in Section 5.4.5 above.

6.5.3. The formal investigation process should be conducted by one or more people formally appointed by the responsible office. These people should have the necessary specialized knowledge required by the nature of the allegation and should not have potential conflicts of interest that could be reasonably perceived as affecting their impartiality in the evaluation.

6.5.3.1. In the case of alleged serious scientific misconduct, the formal investigation process should be conducted by a committee composed of at least three individuals who did not participate in the preliminary evaluation process. At least one of the committee members should not have any formal connection with the involved research institution.

6.5.4. The entire formal investigation process should be rigorous, impartial and fair, guaranteeing the respondent the unrestricted right to defense. During the process, the respondent should be informed of and invited to avail themselves of all the evidence and other substantiating elements that were collected and deemed relevant to the investigation's conclusion.

6.5.5. The research institution should assure that the investigators have access to all research records and reports related to the scientific misconduct at hand, with the exception of those legally protected by confidentiality restrictions.

6.5.6. All people actively involved in a formal investigation process should provide a prior declaration of the existence or nonexistence of any potential conflicts of interest that may be reasonably perceived as prejudicial to the impartiality of their participation in the process.

6.5.7. The formal investigation should be conducted in a manner

that reconciles, in the most balanced manner possible, the rigor of the investigation process with the respondent's right to be presumed innocent and to have his or her reputation preserved.

6.5.8. With the exception of cases involving public health or safety, the entire formal investigation of scientific misconduct should be conducted with the greatest degree of confidentiality possible without impairing the rigorousness and fairness of the investigation. Throughout the process, all participants other than the respondent should maintain the confidentiality of information obtained through their participation. Reports and records concerning the process may only be disseminated to the institution's directors and to FAPESP. Information about the identities of people who are in any way involved in the process should be given only to those who must have it if the investigation is to be fairly and rigorously conducted.

6.5.9. All formal investigation procedures, as well as all collected and evaluated evidences and substantiating elements, should be recorded, and the records should be stored for a minimum five-year period. FAPESP may request copies of these records and any information about the process at any time.

6.5.10. Once begun, a formal investigation process may only be interrupted if the respondent expressly admits that the alleged misconduct occurred and assumes full responsibility for it. In particular, the retraction of a scientific misconduct allegation and the dissolution of the relationship between the respondent and the research institution will not interrupt the process.

6.5.11. At the end of the formal investigation process, those managing the process should communicate the investigation's conclusions in a circumstantiated report and justify them based on the evidence and other substantiating elements examined. This report should be sent to the respondent, who should be given a 30-day period to comment on the report if he or she so desires. After this period, the formal investigation process is closed, and

the final report and any related comments from the respondent should be sent to FAPESP.

**6.6. Declaratory Statement.** Based on the final report of the formal investigation process and any comments from the respondent with respect to it, or with the respondent's admission of fault, the research institution should make a circumstantiated and justified statement that should contain its conclusions on Topics (b), (c) and (d) in Section 5.5 above. If relevant, the Declaratory Statement should also contain the punitive and corrective measures relative to the scientific damages caused by the misconduct in question to be taken as consequence of acknowledgement of the misconduct.

6.6.1. Under normal circumstances, the Declaratory Statement should be issued within a 60-day period beginning when the formal investigation process ends.

6.6.2. The seriousness of the punitive and corrective measures to be taken as a consequence of the misconduct's acknowledgement should be proportional to the seriousness of the misconduct.

6.6.3. The Declaratory Statement should be sent to FAPESP immediately upon its release.

**6.7. FAPESP and the research institutions are jointly responsible for guaranteeing that all allegations of scientific misconduct related to research it supports be adequately evaluated and investigated and that appropriate punitive and corrective measures are taken.**

6.7.1. FAPESP shall formally receive any allegation of misconduct related to research it supports, sent either by the institution where the research is being or has been conducted or directly from any other person or institution. In the case that it receives a direct allegation or becomes aware of misconduct by any other means, FAPESP will immediately notify the institution where the research is being or has been conducted as to the existence and nature of the allegation so that the institution may begin the proceedings prescribed in this code.

**6.8. FAPESP may at any time initiate and conduct an independent**

evaluation and investigation of any allegation of scientific misconduct related to research that it supports. The management of these processes will follow, *mutatis mutandis*, the guidelines detailed in Sections 5.4 and 5.5 above.

**6.9.** Upon becoming aware of an allegation of scientific misconduct, FAPESP may, taking into account the seriousness of the alleged misconduct and the supporting evidence available, temporarily suspend the grant or scholarship related to the allegation if such actions are deemed necessary to protect the interest of science or preserve public health, safety and resources.

**6.10.** FAPESP shall release its own Declaratory Statement on any allegation of scientific misconduct that it receives and judges to be worthy of investigation, respecting, *mutatis mutandis*, the guidelines detailed in Section 5.6 above. When producing its statement, FAPESP shall consider the final report of the research institution's formal investigation and the respondent's responses to it; the research institution's Declaratory Statement; the conclusions of FAPESP's independent investigation process, if conducted; and the respondent's commentaries in response to it.

6.10.1. The punitive measures that FAPESP may impose on those found guilty of scientific misconduct include a letter of reprimand, temporary suspension of the right to apply for FAPESP grants or scholarships and refund of the resources that FAPESP granted the guilty parties to produce the misconduct-related research, among others.

6.10.2. The corrective measures that FAPESP may take relative to the misconduct-related scientific damages include requiring the correction of the records and reports of the misconducted-related research and notifying the people or institutions potentially affected by the misconduct of FAPESP Declaratory Statement of the misconduct, among others.

6.10.3. FAPESP may also take contractual measures, such as the cancellation of existing grants or scholarships for which those guilty of the misconduct are beneficiaries or are responsible.

6.10.4. FAPESP grants those that it declares guilty of scientific misconduct the right to appeal such declaration.

**6.11. FAPESP's Scientific Director's Office is responsible for**

- (a) Formally receiving allegations, notifications of allegations, and information related to them;
- (b) Analyzing the conclusions of the preliminary evaluations and investigations of such allegations conducted by research institutions;
- (c) Initiating and coordinating independent preliminary evaluations and investigations that FAPESP may choose to conduct;
- (d) Elaborating and presenting to the FAPESP Executive Board a Declaratory Statement addressing such allegations;
- (e) Elaborating and presenting to the FAPESP Executive Board a proposal that the FAPESP's Declaratory Statement be released to the Public Attorney's Office, if such action is deemed necessary.



SÃO PAULO RESEARCH FOUNDATION

Rua Pio XI, 1500 - Alto da Lapa  
CEP 05468-901 - São Paulo - SP  
+55-11-3838-4000  
[www.fapesp.br](http://www.fapesp.br)