This document was endorsed by the General Assembly of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in its decision 22/2024 (V. 29.).

SCIENCE ETHICS CODE OF CONDUCT OF THE HUNGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Preamble

Pursuant to Section 3(1)g) of the Act XL of 1994 on the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (the "Academy Act"), according to which it is a public duty of the Academy to "safeguard the integrity of scientific discourse, the freedom of scientific research and of expressing scientific opinions", as well as in line with similar initiatives and efforts in the international scientific community, this Science Ethics Code determines the fundamental ethical principles that are to be observed by all those engaged in scientific research. It describes the best practices to be followed in the course of the conduct of scientific research, of the communication, review and assessment of its results, and it sets out the cases and procedures when violation of research ethics occurs. The further objective of this Science Ethics Code is to constantly remind researchers, research-performing institutions and research-funding organisations, of their role in maintaining the integrity of scientific research.

The integrity of scientific research is based on the ethical principles which are necessary to define good research practices and to ensure the preservation of the trustworthiness and reliability of the research process. Researchers' integrity consists of an active and personal commitment to abiding by the basic principles of science ethics and to striving for high-quality and conscientious research work. It encompasses the basic responsibility of the research community to formulate and observe the principles of research, to define the criteria for proper research behaviour, to maximise the quality, reliability and robustness of research and its results, and to respond adequately to threats to, or violations of, good research practices.

The fundamental principles of science ethics and the prohibition of their violation draw on fundamental and universal moral principles. Therefore, they have been incorporated in this Science Ethics Code without disciplinary, cultural or regional compromises, and are applicable to research activities regardless of whether they are financed by public or private funding.

While different research disciplines may use different approaches, they each share the motivation to increase our understanding of ourselves and the world in which we live. Therefore, the good research practices as presented in this Code of Conduct apply to research in all scientific fields, and are equally valid for existing and new research processes, such as for instance citizen science involving non-professional researchers or participatory research based on the engagement of community stakeholders having an interest in the effectiveness of research.

The Code of Conduct is not a law or not a legal norm, but a necessary tool for preserving the integrity and ethical self-regulation of the scientific research world.

The fourteen years that have passed since the entry into force of the Science Ethics Code of Conduct has seen a practice that demonstrated the effectiveness of the Code in preserving the morality and integrity of scientific research in Hungary. Upon the adoption of the Science Ethics Code of Conduct, an overwhelming majority of scientific research institutions have either directly applied it or formulated regulations of their own based on the ethical standards of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. In order to preserve the authoritative role of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in science ethics, it is necessary to adjust the norms of the Science Ethics Code adopted in 2010 to the major changes that the research practices, the publication of research results and research assessment have recently undergone.

This document is the revised edition of the Science Ethics Code which was adopted by the General Assembly of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 2010, and it draws on the 2023 revised edition of "The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity"[1] adopted by the All European Academies (ALLEA).

1 Scope

The scope of the Science Ethics Code shall apply to all members of the public association of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (hereinafter referred to as "MTA"), the researchers belonging to research groups co-financed by MTA, the recipients of research grants or fellowships provided by MTA as well as all those persons involved in the procedures leading to the award of such grants or fellowships and the procedures themselves, furthermore, to the

[1] https://allea.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/European-Code-of-Conduct-Revised-Edition-2023.pdf

procedures conducted by MTA's Science Ethics Committee (hereinafter referred to as "TeB") and the procedures leading to the award of the Doctor of MTA title and all persons involved in these procedures, in addition, to the recipients of awards conferred by MTA in recognition of their scientific careers (hereinafter collectively referred to as "researchers").

MTA recommends to all other institutions and organisations engaged in the pursuit of science to ensure the general applicability of this Code of Conduct in the entire scope of their activities or to draw on it in formulating a science ethics code of their own.

2 Fundamental Principles of Research Integrity

The fundamental principles of research integrity guide researchers and research entities in their research work as well as in their engagement with practical, ethical and intellectual challenges inherent in research and in finding connections to the societal landscape surrounding research. The principles listed below apply to the entire research process and provide the basis for good research practices.

2.1 Honesty in presenting scientific goals and research intentions, in giving a meticulous description of scientific methods, procedures and well-founded interpretations, and also in explaining possibilities, dangers and justifiable claims inherent in the application of results.

2.2 Reliability in performing research, recording, storing and presenting data. Eliminating negligence and inattention. Full reporting on the accomplishments and results of research.

2.3 Objectivity: interpretations and conclusions must be exclusively founded on facts or impartial and logical proof and on data the correctness of which can be verified.

2.4 Impartiality and independence from any interested party or group interest, from any ideology or political pressure, and from economic or financial influence.

2.5 Openness in discussing the results with other researchers and in publishing results, thereby contributing to the accumulation of a common legacy of knowledge. Openness presupposes the availability and accessibility of data supporting results published in a research paper for all interested fellow researchers and the general

public. This fundamental principle may be restricted for a valid reason going back to special considerations arising from the nature of the research (intellectual property rights, personality rights, etc.). Openness is also restricted during ongoing research.

2.6 Respect for research participants and research subjects, be they humans or animals, the environment and the cultural heritage. Tests on humans or animals must always be in conformity with procedures normally stipulated in legislation as well, and must be carried out with respect and care.

2.7 Fairness when it comes to presenting the work of others and providing references. The professional integrity of fellow researchers must be respected and their results must be handled justly.

2.8 Responsibility for future science generations. The guidance and training of early-career researchers requires special attention, the communication and increased respect of ethical norms.

2.9 Selfless and unbiased participation in the research community, in the peer review process, scientific panels and committees.

2.10 Accountability for the research from idea to publication, for its management and organisation, for training, supervision and mentoring.

3 Performing Scientific Research

3.1 Planning the Research Project

3.1.1 Defining the Goals of Research

Freedom of scientific research as a fundamental principle shall not mean an unlimited freedom in planning a specific research project. Limits may be imposed in particular where the research goals or methods appear to raise ethical concerns, or where the planned research action has the potential to involve risks or harm for individuals, the society at large or the environment.

3.1.2 Feasibility of the Research

The feasibility of the research presupposes a self-critical and ethical assessment of the research objective both by the researcher and the scientific community. It is especially important not to set unrealistic goals with regard to the research topic in question, and for the researcher not to create unfounded expectations. The originality of the scientific problem raised, the preliminary data, the necessary funding and other conditions must all be given due consideration. The research work should not seek hasty results or the largest possible number of publications.

3.1.3 Documentation of the Research Plan

The research plan shall be recorded in a form set by the entity funding the research. Generally, the research plan specifies who is responsible for the implementation of the research project, what functions the participants have, what the form and resource of the funding of the research are, and how the data and the documentation of experiments are to be processed.

3.1.4 Assessing and Declaring Conflicts of Interest

The providers of research grants and external funders must accept that researchers carry out their work without being influenced. However, if for some special reason they do interfere with the research, it must be made clear under what circumstances and to what extent they have the right to do so, be it in the course of planning, implementation, the review of research data or publication. These agreements must be recorded in writing in advance and made accessible to the management of the institution or organisation concerned, or to the competent ethics committee.

Anyone participating in a research project must declare their interests – financial or otherwise – to the competent authorities as well as other persons authorized to perform checks and reviews over the proposal or research, where this could in any way constitute a conflict of interest in the conduct of the research. No personal interest or bias may be allowed to influence the research, its objectivity, conclusions, or publication of its results.

3.1.5 Filing a Patent

In the event of the possibility of filing a patent, the interested parties – individuals and institutions alike, as well as the entities funding the research – must set out their mutual rights and obligations in a written agreement in due course.

3.2 Implementation of the Research Project

3.2.1 Recording of Data and Other Research Materials, Management of Data

In experimental and observational disciplines research data must be recorded with such precision that allows the verification and reproducibility of research. The data and other documentations generated in the course of the research – both on electronic media and on paper – need to be stored in a way that prevents damage, loss or manipulation. Loss of data has to be separately documented.

Researchers, research institutions and organisations

a) ensure appropriate stewardship, curation and preservation of all data, metadata, protocols, code, software, and other research materials for a reasonable and clearly stated period;

b) ensure that access to data is as open as possible, as closed as necessary, and in line with the FAIR[2] principles (findable, accessible, interoperable, and reusable) for data management;

c) are transparent about how to access and gain permission to use data, metadata, protocols, code, software, and other research materials;

d) inform research participants about how their data will be used, reused, accessed, stored, and deleted, in compliance with the EU's GDPR;

e) acknowledge data, metadata, protocols, code, software, and other research materials as legitimate and citable products of research, and

[2] FAIR: Findability, Accessibility, Interoperability, and Reusability

f) ensure that any contracts or agreements relating to research results include equitable and fair provisions for the management of their use, ownership, and protection under intellectual property rights.

3.2.2 Disclosure of Information on the Research Project

Within the research group the free circulation of information related to the research shall be ensured. During the execution of the research project all participants should be aware of what they are authorized to reveal on the research to persons not belonging to the research group. Upon admission of new members to the group, it is advisable to establish in writing their rights of access to and use of research data and results for the time of the joint work and for the subsequent period.

Researchers report their results and methods in a way that is compatible with the accepted norms of the discipline and facilitates verification and reproducibility. In line with this, it is necessary to indicate if external services or artificial intelligence have been used for the production of the content of the publication.

3.3 Safeguards

3.3.1. Researchers, research institutions, and organisations comply with relevant guidelines and regulations in their treatment of all participants of their research and in their handling of the related data.

3.3.2. Researchers have due regard for the health of individuals connected with their research, and they weigh potential harms and risks.

3.3.3. Researchers overseeing projects that cross professional boundaries, such as citizen science or participatory research, take responsibility for ensuring research integrity standards, oversight, training, and safeguards.

3.4 Collaborative Working

All partners in external research collaborations take responsibility for the integrity of the research and for the formal agreement drawn up at the outset on the goals of the research, the process of communication, the expectations and standards concerning research integrity, the laws and regulations that will apply, protection of the intellectual

property of collaborators, procedures for handling possible cases of misconduct, submission of research results for publication and other forms of dissemination or exploitation of the results.

3.5 Training, Supervision, and Mentoring

Research institutions and organisations

a) ensure that researchers receive rigorous training in research design, methodology, analysis, dissemination, and communication;

b) develop appropriate training in ethics and research integrity.

Researchers lead by example in issues of science ethics and offer specific guidance and training for their team members.

3.6 Research Environment

Research institutions and organisations

a) ensure a culture of research integrity;

b) create an environment of mutual respect and promote values such as equity, diversity, and inclusion;

c) create an environment free from undue pressures on researchers that allows them to work independently and according to the principles of good research practice;

d) demonstrate leadership in clear policies and procedures on good research practice and the transparent and proper handling of suspected research misconduct and violations of research integrity;

e) actively support researchers who receive threats and protect *bona fide* whistle-blowers, taking into account that early career and short-term employed researchers may be particularly vulnerable, and

f) support appropriate infrastructure for the generation, management, and protection of data and research materials in all their forms that are necessary for reproducibility, traceability, and accountability.

4 Publication, Reviewing and Assessment of Scientific Results

The primary forum for researchers to report and publish their findings is the scientific communication (publication) in the format accepted within the scientific discipline concerned and finalised following an independent peer review procedure.

4.1 Scientific Publication

A communication is only considered to be a scientific publication if it is published in a recognised scientific journal, edition of essays or scientific textbook, in print or electronically, by a scientific publisher having an independent editorial board. Prior to the publication, the scientific result may be placed in an internationally known archive or repository (for instance as a preprint), but this cannot be deemed a scientific publication yet. Presenting a non-scientific work (informative article addressed to the public, communication published in a non-professional edition, teaching resources, etc.) as a scientific communication shall constitute an act of research misconduct.

4.2 Entirety and Impartiality

Results shall be published impartially and in their entirety in so much as this is necessary for their fair assessment. The communication shall include a description of the methodology used for experiments and analyses, and their proper references. The deficiencies of the experimental data and the limits of the applied methods shall also be communicated, as well as the sources where charts and databases which have not been presented in the paper in detail may be accessed. In the communication, attention must be drawn to potential risks involved in the experiments conducted. Arbitrary selection of data cannot be tolerated and results conflicting with the conclusions cannot be withheld.

4.3 Proper Citation

The aim should be to cite as widely as possible the substantive background to the research and as fully as possible the scientific literature on the issues under discussion. Using others' ideas, methods or data as one's own through incomplete citation shall constitute an act of research misconduct.

4.4 Authorship

4.4.1

Individuals who in their capacity as a scholar or scientist have significantly contributed to the design and conduct of the experiments, and the analysis, review and publication of the results shall be attributed authorship. A position held in the institution or organisation, or a role in funding the research work does not, by itself, warrant authorship of a scientific paper. Honorary authorship is not allowed.

4.4.2

a) In the case of several authors and the presentation of results of substantially differing experimental processes, the particular contributions of the individual authors must be made obvious. Authors formally agree on the sequence of authorship, acknowledging that authorship itself is based on:

   aa) a significant contribution to the design of the research, relevant data collection, its analysis and/or interpretation;

   ab) drafting and/or critical reviewing of the scientific paper;

   ac) approval of the final scientific paper; and

   ad) agreeing to be responsible for the content of the scientific paper.

b) Authors include an 'Author Contribution Statement' in the final scientific paper, where possible, to determine each author's responsibilities and contributions to the paper.

c) Authors acknowledge the important work and contributions of those who do not meet the criteria for authorship, including collaborators, assistants, and funders who have enabled the research.

4.4.3

Assigning one or more corresponding authors shall be subject to the consent of the other authors. Only those who have played a decisive or coordinating role in drafting the research paper may be assigned the function of corresponding author.

4.4.4

It is not a proper practice to include the same research result in several different stand-alone papers just to increase the number of publications by the same researcher. Cases where the original article was written in a foreign language shall be excepted. In such cases, while in full compliance with copyright law, the publication of a Hungarian language version is desirable for the purposes of sharing the research results with a wider Hungarian research community and cultivating the Hungarian technical language of the given scientific discipline. Making results which have initially been communicated in a Hungarian research paper available to the scientific community abroad through publication in another language may also be an exception. In a republication a proper reference must be made by the author to the initial publication.

4.4.5

Authors are accurate, moderate and honest in their communication to colleagues, policy-makers, and society at large.

4.4.6

Authors must comply with the same requirements or rules as those detailed above whether they publish in a subscription journal, an open access journal, a book, or in any other publication form, including preprint servers.

4.5 Correction

Where in the course of the conduct of the research, some previously published data or finding turn out to be wrong or erroneous, the author must promptly issue a correction, preferably in the periodical that had carried the original article in the first instance. In the case of a paper co-authored by several researchers, it is the corresponding author – having submitted the original communication for publication – who is required to submit the correction. When making a correction, especially when citing the names of the authors, any unsubstantiated allegation of research misconduct against anyone must be avoided. Where any of the authors of the original paper is missing from the communication containing the correction, the reason for their absence must be provided.

4.6 Reviewing and Assessment

4.6.1

It is a significant duty of researchers to engage in refereeing, reviewing, and assessment.

4.6.2

Researchers, research institutions and organisations review and assess submissions for publication, funding, appointment, promotion, or reward in a transparent manner, preferably with justification included, and indicate the use of artificial intelligence.

4.6.3

Reviewers and those engaged in assessment

a) declare any actual or perceived conflicts of interest and, when necessary, withdraw from involvement in discussion and decision making of the reviewing process;

b) maintain confidentiality unless there is prior approval for disclosure; and

c) respect the rights of authors and applicants.

4.6.4

Researchers, research institutions, and organisations adopt assessment practices that are based on principles of quality, knowledge advancement, and scientific impact that go beyond quantitative indicators and take into account diversity, inclusiveness, openness, and collaboration, where relevant.

5 Acts of Research Misconduct

The deliberate violation of any of the ethical principles of research integrity or of good research practices constitutes an act of research misconduct, which is sanctionable. Every effort must be made to prevent, discourage, and stop violations of research ethics through training, supervision, and mentoring, and through the development of a supportive research environment.

5.1 The Most Severe Forms of Research Misconduct

The most severe forms of research misconduct are fabrication, falsification, plagiarism and exerting personal influence in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results.

5.1.1

Fabrication is defined as making up "data" or "results" which are obviously unsubstantiated, and recording and communicating them as if they were real.

5.1.2

Falsification is defined as manipulating research materials, equipment, images, or processes, or changing, omitting, or suppressing data or results without justification.

5.1.3

Plagiarism is defined as presenting other people's ideas, scientific results, texts, illustrations, and other modes of expression as one's own. Scientific publications and the new ideas and illustrations included in them are protected by copyright law.

5.1.4

Exerting personal influence is defined as the act of influencing or attempting to influence individuals involved in research work, or in reviewing, assessing or publishing research results, and thereby offending the dignity of these individuals. It may be directed at forcing a favourable action or statement in the interest of the influencer, but it may also be directed at making an unfavourable decision for a third party. Such practices include in particular: misusing seniority, encouraging violations of research integrity to advance one's own career, intimidating or harassing one's subordinates, unjustified restriction of the freedom of research, as well as any form of discrimination.

Further acts of exerting personal influence include:

a) keeping silence about a suspected violation of research integrity by others;

b) retaliation against a complainant;

c) attempting to increase the number of citations through personal pressure; and

d) participation, despite a conflict of interest, in evaluation or assessment activities.

5.2 Other Violations of Research Ethics as Unacceptable Forms of Behaviour and Practices

In addition to the most severe violations of the fundamental principles of research integrity and of good research practices listed in point 5.1 above, cases of other unacceptable practices or violations of ethical norms may include, but are not confined to:

5.2.1 Research Activity Harming Societal Consensus

Carrying out, in particular, research which is harmful to society, the economy or the environment even if this does not constitute any violation of law.

5.2.2 Jeopardising Research Independence and Integrity

Jeopardising research independence and integrity is defined as an act which consists in

a) allowing funders, sponsors, or others to jeopardise independence and impartiality in the research process, or unbiased reporting of the results;

b) accusing a researcher of research misconduct in a malicious way;

c) intentionally hampering the work of other researchers, and

d) obstructing scientific debate in one's capacity as chair of a scientific session or a thesis defence, or as editor of publications.

5.2.3 Breach of Personality Rights

This may involve violation of the dignity of persons recruited as subjects in a scientific study, failure to inform them about the risks associated with the study, provision of incomplete information or breach of confidentiality.

5.2.4 Inappropriate Management of Data

Under this category fall the unjustified withholding of research data or results, refusing to disclose such data or results to other researchers and thereby preventing

the reproducibility of experimental results. It also covers improper storage of original data, the alteration of data, silencing comments that contradict the desired or produced results, distortion of data, ignoring unexpected results, or misusing statistics.

5.2.5 Acts of Research Misconduct related to Publication

a) Denial of deserved authorship.

b) Claiming undeserved authorship.

c) Granting undeserved authorship.

d) Other misleading claims of merits related to authorship.

e) Hiding the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in the creation of content or in the drafting of publications. The use of any software for checking linguistic accuracy or style shall be exempted.

f) Increasing the number of affiliations of individual authors without justification.

g) Expanding unnecessarily the bibliography of a study to please editors, reviewers, or colleagues, or to manipulate bibliographic data.

h) Establishing, supporting, running, or deliberately and deceptively using journals, publishers, events, or services that undermine the quality of research ("predatory" journals or conferences[3], or paper mills and citation mills).

i) Incomplete acknowledgement of the funders of the research.

5.2.6 Acts of Misconduct related to Processes of Editing, Publishing and Peer Review

a) Tolerating conflicts of interest in the assessment process by reviewers of scientific articles, editors of publications or evaluators of research proposals.

b) Giving advantage to certain authors or applicants by editors or reviewers, or conversely, hindering the publication of a scientific work or the award of a research grant for personal reasons.

[3] The international consensus definition of "predatory publishing" (Nature 576 (7786): 210-212, 2019): "Predatory journals, publishers and conferences are entities that prioritize self-interest at the expense of scholarship and are characterized by false or misleading information, deviation from best editorial and publication practices, a lack of transparency, and/or the use of aggressive and indiscriminate solicitation practices."

c) Participating in cartels of reviewers or authors colluding to review each other's publications or grant applications.

d) Using information gathered in the course of the reviewing for one's own purposes or in connection with some other matter not closely related to the reviewing.

5.2.7 Disclosure of False or Deceptive Data related to One's Scientific Career, Publications, or Awards

It shall be an act of research misconduct to disclose deceptive information about one's scientific career, scientometric data related to publications and research, as well as scientific awards.

6 Procedure for Handling Suspected Violations of Ethical Norms

6.1 The Body Carrying Out the Investigation

6.1.1

Where an allegation of research misconduct has been made, the obligation to initiate and conduct the procedure for the investigation into the issue will – except for cases as provided for in point 6.1.2 below – fall to the higher education institution, research institution or other institution (hereinafter together referred to as "research entity") which is the employer of the researcher against whom the allegation of research misconduct has been made.

6.1.2

MTA's Science Ethics Committee ("TeB") shall act as the competent body in the following cases:

a) to investigate and decide on allegations of research misconduct in MTA's doctoral procedure;

b) to investigate and decide on allegations of research misconduct in a procedure for the withdrawal of the title of Doctor of MTA;

c) to investigate and decide on cases where a researcher belonging to one of the categories listed in Section 1 of this Code of Conduct is being accused of research misconduct;

d) apart from matters defined in point c) above, in cases of research misconduct where both the complainant and the accused have declared in writing to accept the authority of the TeB to conduct the procedure, and

e) where an appeal is being brought to it in a case which was investigated in the first instance by a standing or *ad hoc* ethics committee of the research entity concerned and this research entity has either appointed TeB as the forum of appeal in its internal ethics regulations or adopted this Code of Conduct for direct application in its own ethics investigation procedures.

6.1.3

TeB shall have the power to conduct the procedure for the suspension of membership in the public association of MTA, as determined in Section 21 of the Statutes of MTA.

6.2 Fundamental Principles of the Investigation of Research Misconduct

6.2.1 Establishing the Severity of the Misconduct

For an act of research misconduct to be established it is necessary to establish that the violation of the norm involved was intentional.

6.2.2 Presumption of Innocence

a) Anyone against whom an allegation of research misconduct has been made shall be presumed innocent until proven otherwise.

b) No one shall be sanctioned until the act of misconduct they have been accused of committing has been proven.

6.2.3 Fair and Lawful Conduct of the Investigation

a) Investigations shall be comprehensive, regulated, balanced and objective.

b) Measures must be taken to avoid that the parties who participate in the investigation are personally involved or concerned in the case, or susceptible to be accused of any bias.

c) Investigations must observe the reasonable interests of each party involved in the investigation, as well as the relevant laws and regulations.

d) Procedures must be recorded in exhaustive, written, duly signed and confidential documents.

6.2.4 Uniformity, Non-Discrimination

a) Procedures shall in all cases be conducted in a comparable manner, according to the same principles and practices, without undue discrimination and bias.

b) Measures must be taken to ensure that *bona fide* whistle-blowers do not suffer any harm in any way.

6.2.5 Fair Administration

a) Persons accused of research misconduct must be given full details of the allegation made against them and must be allowed to respond to the allegations in writing, put forward questions, present evidence, make a statement in connection with evidence presented by others, file a motion to present evidence.

b) The parties involved in the procedure must be provided with sufficient information about the procedure itself, with TeB being required – if needed – to keep them updated and provide them with assistance in making their statements.

6.2.6 Proportionality of Sanctions

Any sanction imposed on a person found guilty of research misconduct shall be proportionate to the severity of the misconduct.

6.2.7 Confidentiality of the Procedure and the Data Handled

a) The procedure for the investigation of research misconduct shall be conducted confidentially. Its personal scope should be as restricted as possible in order to protect those involved in the investigation from any unsubstantiated accusations.

Confidentiality must, however, not violate the completeness of the investigation, or damage the health and safety of the personnel engaged in the investigative work.

b) The complainant, the witness or the invited expert may request the confidential treatment of their personal data where they suspect they may be exposed to severe harm as a result of being involved in the procedure.

c) Any data collected in the course of the investigation may only be disclosed to a third party on condition that the latter has signed a declaration of confidentiality and only where this third party needs such data for the enforcement of a right or the performance of an obligation.

6.3 Decisions of the TeB

6.3.1

In the procedure for the investigation of research misconduct, TeB shall decide the case on substance and shall, where relevant, decide on procedural issues.

6.3.2

By way of a conclusion of the procedure for the investigation of research misconduct, the TeB shall, in its decision on substance,

a) establish that the accused has not committed any act of research misconduct. In this case, this decision may be published on the MTA's website at the request of the person complained against, with the data and information specified by him/her.

b) have the possibility to initiate a procedure *ex officio* against a complainant who has been found to submit the complaint maliciously;

c) where an act of research misconduct has been proven;

ca) establish that an act of research misconduct has been committed and – where necessary – forbid the offender from further misbehaviour;

cb) in addition to taking the decision set out in point ca), TeB may send its decision to the entity employing the person who has been found committing research misconduct;

cc) in a case concerning a scientific degree, title, recognition or award, TeB may send the decision to the awarding organisation or person;

cd) in addition, in cases of research misconduct as listed in Section 5.1. of this Science Ethics Code, TeB may order the publication of its definitive decision in the Official Gazette of the Academy as a TeB communication. Apart from the name, scientific degree and scientific title of the person found committing research misconduct, the communication may contain any additional personal data only on condition that the person concerned has given prior consent thereto.

6.3.3

In procedures for the investigation of research misconduct initiated in connection with MTA's doctoral procedure, TeB shall establish in a decision whether or not an act of research misconduct has been committed and shall send this decision to the Doctoral Council.

6.3.4

a) In a procedure for the suspension of membership in the public association of MTA, as determined in Section 21 of the Statutes of MTA, TeB may suspend, for a period determined therein, the membership in MTA's public association of a person sentenced by a court of law in a definitive judgement to imprisonment for a criminal offence committed with intent.

b) Based on a motion put forward by the Academy's competent Scientific Section, TeB may suspend for a maximum period of 3 years the membership in MTA's public association of a person who has been found committing one of the acts of severe research misconduct as listed in Section 5.1 of this Science Ethics Code, provided that all circumstances of the case warrant the use of this sanction as being proportionate to the severity of the misconduct in question.

6.3.5

With a view to safeguarding the freedom of scientific research and the integrity of scientific discourse, TeB shall take a stand in issues concerning principles of research ethics, as part of its powers delegated to it in Section 32(1) of the Statutes of MTA.

6.3.6

Where at the end of a procedure for the investigation of research misconduct TeB considers there is a need to also issue a statement on the general interpretation of principles, it shall take a separate decision on this and shall publish the ensuing statement on the MTA's website without making any reference to the specific case that would enable its identification.

6.4 Appeal in the procedure for the investigation of research misconduct

An appeal may be brought by the complainant or by the accused before the Presidency of MTA against the decision on substance delivered by TeB in the first instance, within 15 days of it being issued. The decisions of TeB on procedural issues may be contested in the appeal against the decision on substance. An individual appeal may be brought by the complainant against a decision dismissing the complaint or a decision terminating the procedure for the investigation of research misconduct, and by the accused against a decision terminating the procedure for the investigation of research misconduct, within 15 days of it being issued in either case.

6.5 Authorizing Provision

Detailed rules of the procedure for the investigation of research misconduct and of the appeal procedure shall be laid down by TeB in its Rules of Procedure. In its Rules of Procedure, the TeB may delegate certain procedural decisions to the chairperson of the TeB.