amtliches mitteilungsblatt

CHARITÉ
UNIVERSITÄTSMEDIZIN BERLIN

15.07.2016 | No. 175
(English translation of the official document by ethnosübersetzung; minor modifications of this translation and translation of the amendment by NeuroCure, 15 August 2016)

Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin Statute Ensuring Good Scientific Practice *from 20 June 2012 (AMBl. Charité No. 092, p. 658) in the version of 02 May 2016*

Table of Contents

Preamble

I. Prevention of Scientific Misconduct and Requirements of Good Scientific Practice

§ 1 General
§ 2 Principles of Good Scientific Practice
§ 3 Authorship of Scientific Publications
§ 4 Young Scientists
§ 5 Cooperation and Leadership Responsibility in Work Groups
§ 6 Performance and Evaluation Criteria
§ 7 Backup and Storage of Primary Data

II. Scientific Misconduct

§ 8 Scientific Misconduct by Scientists
§ 9 Shared Responsibility for Misconduct

III. Ombudspersons and Office for Good Scientific Practice and Inquiry Panel

§ 10 Ombudspersons
§ 11 Duties of Ombudspersons
§ 12 The Office for Good Scientific Practice
§ 12a Inquiry Panel

IV. Investigation of Alleged Scientific Misconduct

§ 13 General Procedural Regulations
§ 14 Preliminary Investigation
§ 15 Main Proceedings
§ 16 Procedure upon Establishing that Scientific Misconduct has Taken Place

V. Entry into Force; Transitional Procedure

§ 17 Entry into Force; Transitional Procedure

On the basis of § 21 Para. 3 in conjunction with § 9 Para. 1, No. 1 of the Berlin University Medicine Act of 5 December 2005 (GVBl. p. 739) in conjunction with § 71, Para. 1, Sentence 1, No. 1 of the Berlin Higher Education Act of 13 February 2003 (GVBl. 82) in the version dated 26 July 2011 (GVBl. p. 379), the Faculty Council issued the following statute on 14 May 2012 (confirmed by the Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin Board of Directors in accordance with § 90, Para. 1 of the Berlin Higher Education Act, in conjunction with §13 of the Berlin University Medicine Act) and adopted the second amendment on 02 May 2016:

All personal and professional descriptions in this statute apply equally to women and men.

Preamble

Scientific work is based upon a set of fundamental principles; foremost among them is honesty to oneself and others. Honesty is both an ethical standard and a foundational aspect of scientific professionalism, i.e., of *good scientific practice*. Ensuring that the necessary conditions are met for its observance and application in practice is one of the core responsibilities comprising scientific self-governance. Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin is aware of its duty to convey *good scientific practice* to students and young scientists, and to ensure that it is observed at Charité unconditionally. All Charité staff and associates, but especially the university professors, have a duty to uphold these fundamentals of *good scientific practice*, to teach them and to set examples in their observance.

Scientific work serves to help gain knowledge. Honesty on the part of the scientist is a fundamental precondition for this. Unlike error, which can sometimes be difficult to distinguish, dishonesty in scientific work contradicts the very essence of science as well as the scientist's responsibility to society. Charité has an obligation, both to the public and to the scientific community, to clarify any suspicions in this regard.

The honesty required of the scientist cannot be replaced by any set of rules; legal framework conditions cannot prevent all misconduct in scientific work. However, rules can attempt to minimize such misconduct. Furthermore, scientific misconduct cannot be judged solely on the basis of a set of general rules; the circumstances of each individual case must be the primary consideration when determining a reasonable course of disciplinary action.

I. Prevention of Scientific Misconduct and Requirements of Good Scientific Practice

§ 1 General

(1) The following regulations on ensuring good scientific practice are designed to help avoid scientific misconduct to the greatest possible extent, thereby promoting quality of scientific work.

(2) Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin also upholds its responsibility to its graduates by imparting the fundamentals of scientific work and good scientific practice to its students (medical students as well as those enrolled in all other courses and educational programs at Charité) with regard to this statute and by encouraging them to practice honesty and accountability in science.

This should also include calling their attention to the possibility of scientific misconduct. Doctoral and professorial candidates are required to attend courses on good scientific practice (focused primarily on experimental design, analysis of primary data, statistics and authorship). These courses are run by either the Graduate Colleges or Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin.

(3) Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin upholds its responsibility to its young scientists and to its technical personnel by informing these individuals about the fundamentals of scientific work and good scientific practice in accordance this statute; this instruction is provided in written form, and is to be certified with a signature. Generally speaking, this instruction is given as part of the hiring procedure.

(4) The statement of independent authorship (part of the dissertation or habilitation) will be expanded to include a declaration that the rules of good scientific practice, as presented in this statute, have been upheld. As a precondition for initiating degree approval procedures, doctoral and post-doctoral students must submit a statement in which they agree to comply with this statute ensuring good scientific practice. Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin verifies compliance with these rules, e.g., by requiring that primary data be presented on a readable storage medium and/ or in the lab book; by tracing back results and illustrations to primary data; or by checking dissertations or habilitations for plagiarism and correct citation methods.

(5) All Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin members are obliged to comply with this statute. This also applies to doctoral and professorial candidates, visiting scientists and stipend recipients who are not employees of Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin.

(6) Independent of this statute, in the processing (collection, storage, modification, transfer, blocking, deletion, and use) of personal data according to §4 BlnDSG in the context of scientific activity, legislation applicable to the Charité in this regard (such as BlnDSG, BDSG, LKHG Berlin), and the transfer of duties of the board of directors of the Charité regarding responsibility for implementation of data protection must be complied with. All persons working in science agree to comply with the legal requirements regarding data protection in accordance with the legislation to be observed, and with the legally binding patient informed consents approved by the responsible Data Protection Officer. The scientist declares that all applicable regulatory and criminal provisions in this regard are known to him or her. The existing reporting requirement for the automated processing of personal data according to § 19 BlnDSG has to be fulfilled by all persons working in science.
Personal data and (tissue) samples must be stored for the defined period of time in the department/ institute of the Charité without accessibility by third parties. They may only be transmitted to those places outside the department/ institute of the Charité indicated in the legally binding patient informed consents in an anonymous form, and in cases when the research purpose cannot be achieved with anonymous data, in pseudonymous form on the basis of the obtained written informed consent.
All persons working in science must ensure that in the event of a revocation of a written informed consent by the person affected, the respective data will be anonymized or deleted unless this is contrary to legal requirements.
For automated processing of data that are subject to a professional or official secret, a prior checking in accordance with data protection legislation must be conducted by the competent Data Protection Officer.

§ 2
Principles of Good Scientific Practice

(1) The general principles of scientific work include, in particular:

- Patients, probands, animals and the environment should be treated with respect and their integrity protected.
- Using the most up-to-date standards of knowledge available, and having all necessary qualifications/ training. Knowing the current state of research and the appropriate methods is thus essential.
- Creating protocols; methods used and results achieved must be documented in written/ photographic form or in another comparable way. These documents are to be stored using durable, safe storage media for at least 10 years following publication (§7 (1) of this statute). Retention requirements related to legal obligations, and measures protecting personal data, remain unaffected by this statute. Precise logging and documentation of all scientific procedures and results is absolutely necessary in experimental research, as it is a defining characteristic of this type of research that tests be reproducible.
- Consistently calling all of one's own results into question;
- Maintaining strict honesty with regard to contributions by partners, competitors, and predecessors;
- Sharing scientific results with the scientific community in the form of publications. Scientific publications are, therefore, as much the results of scientists´ work -as the scientific observations or scientific themselves.
- The recognised fundamentals of scientific work in all of the individual disciplines are to be upheld. Quality should always have priority over quantity in exams, when awarding academic titles, issuing teaching licenses, during hiring and appointment processes, and when evaluating research achievements.

(2) Every member of Charité as well as all persons according to § 1(5) have the responsibility to ensure that these principles are upheld - both by themselves and by all of the employees they supervise. The principles are an integral part of the education, continuing education and training of young scientists and technical staff, who must not only gain theoretical knowledge and technical skills, but also an ethical perspective on scientific work (multiple component of the curriculum).
Approval from the competent ethics committee must be obtained before starting research with human samples and data. The protection of the right to informational self-determination must be ensured through strict observance of the provisions of data protection.

§ 3
Authorship of Scientific Publications

(1) Authors of scientific publications always bear joint responsibility for these publications' contents. So-called "honorary authorship" is inadmissible. If their purpose is to report new scientific findings, publications should:

- describe findings clearly and completely, including indications on, or references to, all methodological details;
- completely and correctly demonstrate (cite) all preparatory work performed by either the authors themselves or by others;
- restate previously published results only in a clearly identified form, and only to the extent that this repetition is necessary to clarify the connection.

All co-authors should confirm by signature the release of the manuscript for publication. The proportion of work performed by each individual person or work group is to be documented (e.g., using the publisher's standard form, or via special agreement). If the manuscript cites another person's unpublished research results or another institution's unpublished findings, written permission is to be obtained, except in instances where other practices are recognised within a particular discipline.

(2) The authors of an original scientific publication are all persons, and only those persons, who have personally made significant contributions to: study or experiment design; or the development, analysis, and interpretation of data; and formulation of the manuscript itself—and who have agreed to its publication (i.e., to share responsibility for it). Persons who have made significant contributions to the study or experiment design, or to the development, analysis and interpretation of data must be given the opportunity to work together on the production of a manuscript for the publication of the results and to become a co-author. Under this definition of authorship, other—even significant— contributions such as

- fundraising responsibilities;
- providing rooms, funds/equipment, personnel or other resources;
- providing important research materials, e.g., gathering general information on relevant test subjects or patients;
- training/instructing co-authors in the use of established methods;
- participating in data collection and compilation;
- reading the manuscript without being involved in shaping its content;
- managing the institution or organisational unit in which the publication was created;

are not in and of themselves, considered sufficient to justify a claim of co-authorship.
Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin expressly supports the Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals and Clinical Trial Registration[1] guidelines regarding scientific publications and authorship.

(3) Granting consent to being named as a co-author means sharing responsibility to ensure that the publication meets scientific requirements. This is particularly true of the area in which the co-author made his or her contribution. Co-authors are responsible for the correctness of their own contributions, and also have a duty to ensure that these contributions are incorporated into the publication in a scientifically defensible way.

(4) Should individual scientists be named as co-authors of a publication without their permission and consider themselves unable to grant such permission, they are expected to make their opposition to being named as co-authors expressly clear to the primary responsibility holder and/or the editorial board of the journal or publishing house affected.

(5) Prior to a manuscript being submitted to a scientific journal or sent to a publisher as a book contribution, all related analyses and findings must be documented in laboratory books and stored in electronic files (see § 7 of this statute). Furthermore, an authorship agreement indicating each author's level of contribution to the manuscript should be created and stored securely.

§ 4
Young Scientists

(1) Educating and promoting the next generation of scientists is an important duty for Charité. Besides teaching them methodological skills, Charité will impart an ethical attitude towards scientific work, responsible use of findings, and cooperation with other scientists.

(2) Whenever possible, doctoral students and other young scientists should be supervised by at least two experienced scientists, of whom one should belong to a different work group or institute from the young scientist. Names of the supervising scientists must be documented in writing when work begins. The supervising scientists should be available to provide help and advice, as well as to mediate in conflict situations if necessary. Each young scientist must have a primary mentor within the work group; this mentor is also responsible for teaching him or her about the Statute Ensuring Good Scientific Practice at Charité- Universitätsmedizin Berlin.

[1] N. Engl. J. Med. 2004;351:1250-51; ibid. 2005;352:2436-38;both ICMJE; www.icmje.org/

(3) Inasmuch as other statutes—particularly doctoral and post-doctoral program regulations as well as procedure rules for examinations—already include provisions on supervision of young scientists, this will fulfil the supervisory requirements set out in Paragraph 2.

§ 5
Cooperation and Leadership Responsibility in Work Groups

(1) Each scientist is responsible for his or her own behaviour. Anyone who accepts leadership duties also bears responsibility for the working environment within the entire unit he or she is leading. Lively communication within the work group and solid mentoring relationships are the most effective means of preventing dishonest behaviour. Whoever is leading a work group has the obligation to make sure that both of these are maintained at all times.

(2) Leaders of scientific work groups must create organisational structures that ensure that findings achieved in specialised division of work can be shared, criticised, and integrated into a common pool of knowledge.

(3) Research group leaders are responsible for establishing appropriate organisational procedures which ensure that management, monitoring, conflict resolution, and quality control duties are clearly assigned and actually fulfilled.

§ 6
Performance and Evaluation Criteria

As a performance and evaluation criterion, quality always takes precedence over quantity: when bestowing academic titles, issuing teaching licenses or granting promotions; in hiring or appointment procedures; and when awarding funding or resources.

§ 7
Backup and Storage of Primary Data

(1) All primary data must be stored on durable, secure storage media within the group/ organisation where it was gathered, and remain accessible to the authorized employees for at least ten years after its collection. An early separation of personally identifiable information from study data is encouraged. If this data is to form the basis for journal articles, books, dissertations or post-doctoral theses, the files containing the relevant primary data for each publication must be compiled into a directory (folder); this directory must remain accessible for the legally required length of time, but for no less than ten years following the publication of the document in question.

(2) The responsibility for data storage lies with the respective scientist. Moreover, is it his or her obligation to provide the necessary proof of proper logging. The scientist is permitted to make copies of the data if this is permitted according to the provisions of data protection.

(3) The primary test of any scientific finding is its reproducibility. Experiments and numerical calculations can only be reproduced when all important steps can be retraced. For this to be possible, they must be documented with sufficient thoroughness that a person familiar with the subject would be able to reconstruct the experiments and considerations involved.

(4) The log-/ workbook ("lab book") must have a hard cover and numbered pages; pages must not be torn out. Electronic lab books must fulfil the requirements of 21 CFR Part 11 of the United States Food and Drug Administration. The data stored with the electronic lab book may not be made available outside of the Charité but only internally via the intranet. Original data disappearing within the period of archiving obligation is not reconcilable with scientific diligence. It represents a *prima facie* justification for suspecting culpable scientific misconduct. The same applies to data which, by its nature, can only be stored on electronic media, e.g., as files. These files must be listed in the log book. Original data must be securely stored by the responsible scientist out of sight in locked containers.

(5) Original data and log books are the property of the faculty, and may not leave the department/ institute of the Charité without a legal basis at any time. Copies may be taken by the scientist, if not contrary to the provisions of data protection. When a scientist departs, he or she must document the handing over of original data and log books, including information on date, time, and scope, in an appropriate form countersigned by the receiver of the data. The institution receiving the data is then responsible for keeping the data safe and monitoring its whereabouts. Files are to be stored in their original format on Charité's central server, which is specifically intended for that purpose. Until this server is available, the data should be provided on CDs, DVDs, Blu-ray discs or other suitable storage media. The Dean and his or her representatives have the right to inspect the original data, or to instruct the relevant institution to make it available for inspection, at any time.

II. Scientific Misconduct

§ 8
Scientific Misconduct by Scientists

The Medical Faculty of Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin responds with utmost attention and stringency to every suspected incident of non-compliance with good scientific practice in research, education, and patient care.
Violations of good scientific practice include:

a. Fabrication of data (inventing data and/ or results) and publication of such data;

b. Falsification (data manipulation, suppression, or modifications to experimental conditions which are not properly taken into account in the evaluation);

c. Plagiarism (use of ideas, notes, results, or arguments and descriptions of another person or oneself without naming that person or oneself and giving due credit);

d. Unsubstantiated presumption or acceptance of scientific authorship or co-authorship; claims on the co-authorship of another person without his or her permission;

e. Wrongful obstruction of other scientists' research activity or attempts to diminish another person's scientific reputation;

f. Sabotage of research work (including damaging, destroying or manipulating experimental designs, equipment, documents, hardware, software, chemicals, or other materials needed by another person to carry out his or her research);

g. Culpable destruction of primary data and culpable violation of documentation and retention requirements pursuant to §7;

h. Culpable removal of samples or test materials from Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin.

i. Grossly negligent violation of the principles of scientific practice according to § 2 of the Statutes.

§ 9
Shared Responsibility for Misconduct

Joint responsibility for misconduct can result from, among other things,

- involvement in others' misconduct;
- knowledge of others' falsifications;
- gross neglect of supervisory duties.

III. Ombudspersons and Office for Good Scientific Practice and Inquiry Panel

§ 10
Ombudspersons

The faculty selects at least three experienced scientists with doctoral degrees who have been employed at Charité for a long period, and who either have permanent employment or government contracts or have retired, to serve as points of contact (ombudspersons) for anyone wishing to make allegations of scientific misconduct. A person should not be appointed ombudsperson if he or she might be personally obliged to take relevant action (e.g., as a dean or vice dean) after receiving such information. Ombudsperson serve terms of office lasting two and a half years, and may be re-elected.

§ 11
Duties of Ombudspersons

Ombudspersons have the following responsibilities:

- They provide confidential consultation to those persons who inform them about suspected scientific misconduct as described in § 8; they also take it upon themselves to act on relevant details, including those provided to them through third parties.
- They examine the allegations for their plausibility and decide whether the preliminary investigation can be discontinued (preliminary investigation as per § 14 paragraph 2); otherwise, they propose to the Faculty Board that the main proceedings be initiated.
- Every year, in consultation with the Office for Good Scientific Practice (§ 12 of this statute),
- They report to the dean about their work. In particular, they report on the number of incidents investigated, the number of incidents which were forwarded to the committee and the nature of the allegations (to the extent that this is possible in anonymised form) (§ 14 and § 15 of the Statutes).

They are obliged to take the informing and affected parties' rights to privacy into account when documenting their actions, and must observe a comprehensive code of professional confidentiality when performing their duties.

§ 12
The Office for Good Scientific Practice

The duties of this office are to coordinate and monitor measures taken to ensure good scientific practice.
It:

- supports the development and implementation of good scientific practice curricula for undergraduate and graduate students;
- coordinates and supports the ombudsperson's work (§ 11 of this statute);
- advises and supports persons who are directly or indirectly affected by scientific misconduct (e.g. informants, accused persons, fellow work group members);
- works with committees investigating allegations of scientific misconduct in an advisory capacity;
- makes plagiarism detection software available;
- advises the Charité doctoral and post-doctoral committees (e.g. in matters of plagiarism and when performing random sample testing on dissertations and habilitation theses);
- helps coordinate exchanges with national and international experts on the subject of good scientific practice;
- provides the dean with an annual account of its work investigating accusations of scientific misconduct, including anonymised information on the numbers of cases which underwent preliminary and main investigational proceedings (§ 14 and § 15 of the Statute).

12a
Inquiry Panel

(1) For the examination of allegations of scientific misconduct, the Charité shall set up a permanent Inquiry Panel.

(2) The Panel is independent and not subject to any instructions. It decides by majority vote of the appointed members.

(3) The Panel is made up of five members and their proxies, who should be for the most part scientists and not hold any positions with a management role in the autonomous administrative bodies of the faculty. The Panel should also have external members. The Commission shall choose a Chairperson.

(4) The members of the Panel will be appointed by the Faculty Management. For a period of two and a half years with the agreement of the Faculty Council.

(5) In case of prevention or in case of conflict of interest, the relevant panel member shall be represented by their proxy.

(6) The Panel shall set its own agenda.

IV. Investigations of Alleged Scientific Misconduct

§ 13
General Procedural Regulations

(1) The responsible organisations shall observe principles of proportion and due discretion when conducting all preliminary and main investigations, and perform these according to transparent criteria.

As regards due discretion, the following general principles are to receive particular consideration:

a. All affected parties are to be shown fairness, and objectivity.
b. All allegations and proceedings are to be handled confidentially.
c. The person affected by the allegation is to be included in the proceedings as early on as possible.
d. The privacy rights of the person making the accusations (Whistleblower) are to be protected.

(2) Whistleblowers who, in good faith, give specifiable information regarding suspected scientific misconduct will be protected from any prejudice concerning their own academic and career advancement; the Charité is required to take appropriate measures to ensure this protection. Anonymous tips may also be useful. Knowing the name of the whistleblower is desirable because it allows inquiries. The name will be kept confidential and only provided to the accused person if disclosing the name is necessary for his or her defense (see conditions in § 15 (5) of this statute).

(3) Allegations by the whistleblower must be made in good faith. Accusations may not be raised without being checked and without sufficient knowledge of the facts. Careless handling of accusations of scientific misconduct, especially deliberately making false accusations, may itself be a form of scientific misconduct.

§ 14
Preliminary investigations

(1) Immediately after becoming aware of a suspected incident of non-compliance with good scientific practice, a person expressing the suspicion, a person affected, or the person responsible for the department in question must first inform the ombudsperson, who is then responsible for conducting preliminary investigations.

(2) The ombudsperson decides whether the preliminary investigation can be discontinued due to its lacking substance or being based upon demonstrably false information.

(3) In cases of reasonable suspicion, the ombudsman informs the Faculty Board and the Office for Good Scientific Practice, who then decide on appropriate measures to secure the relevant primary data. Should other scientific institutions be involved, they will be asked for their cooperation in investigating the allegations.

(4) Without delay, the scientist affected by the suspicions of misconduct will be informed of the allegations made against him or her (without being told the name of the person making the allegations), and will be given the opportunity to comment. The accused scientist is to be informed that he or she is free to decide whether to state his or her position on the allegations, and that he or she has the right to consult or bring in a legal adviser of his or her choice. A reasonable deadline is to be set for this positioning statement, one which is not less than three weeks after being informed of the allegations.

(5) The relevant scientist is obliged to submit the primary data necessary for a confidential analysis of the suspicion (see § 7 Para. 4, 5).

(6) After hearing the persons against whom the allegations are directed, or after this deadline has passed, the Faculty Board - under the advisement of the ombudsperson responsible - makes a decision as to whether to formally initiate main proceedings.

§ 15
Main Proceedings

(1) The main proceedings shall be opened by the transmission of the ruling to open formal main proceedings to the inquiry panel. It shall be provided with all necessary data and original documents by the department.

(2) The inquiry panel shall consider all available evidence in order to determine whether scientific misconduct has occurred. The accused person is to be given a suitable opportunity to comment, after having been informed that he or she is free to decide whether to state a position on the allegations, and that he or she has the right to consult or bring in a legal adviser of his or her choice. He or she may present

information orally as well if he or she desires; this right to an oral hearing also extends to any other persons being questioned. After the inquiry panel has re-heard the persons against whom the allegations have been raised, along with any other necessary parties involved, it submits a report to the Faculty Board which indicates whether rules of good scientific practice (§ 2 of the Statute) have been violated and whether this violation was culpable in nature. It should also contain a recommendation for next steps.

(3) During the main proceedings, if additional suspicions arise regarding scientific misconduct by the same group of people, the inquiry panel may expand the scope of the main proceedings without needing to conduct new preliminary investigations. Those affected must be informed of this decision immediately.

(4) At its discretion, the investigative committee may bring in expert advisors in the scientific field under investigation, experts in dealing with such cases, and legal advisors as additional consulting members. Anyone involved in the proceedings or brought in to provide professional consultation must treat all information as confidential.

(5) If, in order to defend himself or herself properly, the accused person needs to know the name of the person raising the allegations, this information will be shared with him or her. The whistleblower is to be informed of this beforehand. He or she can appeal against this decision within a period of three weeks. A rejection of the appeal must occur within two weeks.

(6) In cases of concurrently pending legal or disciplinary proceedings involving substantially the same allegations, the investigative committee may decide to suspend proceedings.

(7) The inquiry panel's decision and report may not be appealed, in the meaning of § 2.

(8) Anyone involved or instructed in the proceedings must treat all information as confidential.

(9) Records of the main proceedings are to be kept on file for 30 years.

(10) Based on the committee's report and recommendations, the Faculty Board decides what measures are to be taken.

§ 16
Procedure upon Establishing that Scientific Misconduct has Taken Place

(1) If scientific misconduct (§ 8 of the Statute) has been confirmed, in consideration of this statute as well as of any applicable legislation, the responsible authorities shall determine what measures can be taken in due discretion to correct the scientific misconduct and to re-establish trust in the honesty of scientific research and education.
Such measures include, in particular, the following:

a. In cases of culpable scientific misconduct, a reprimand may be issued along with a recommendation or order that the academic treatises or dissertations, monographs, and/ or publications in question be withdrawn. Decisions regarding the possibility of correcting and re-submitting the work lie with the publisher of the magazine or book.
b. In the absence of the underlying original data within the generally accepted 10-year period in which scientists must keep it available, the relevant publications or monographs should be ordered to be withdrawn.
c. In cases of demonstrable and deliberate data falsification/ manipulation/ fabrication, the relevant publications or monographs must be ordered to be withdrawn.
d. Should falsified results have been published (§ 16 (1) c of this statute), the public is to be informed of this.
e. All parties affected by scientific misconduct, e.g., scientific journals or persons robbed of their intellectual property, must be informed.
f. Additional measures going beyond these may be undertaken, if they are necessary for the correction or punishment of scientific misconduct.

(2) The responsibility for the measures under § 16 Para. 1 lies with the faculty board, for measures under § 16 Para. 1 f. this only applies if no other responsibility already exists.

(3) Measures taken in accordance with disciplinary, labour, criminal, civil, administrative, budgetary, or academic-examination laws remain unaffected.

V. Entry into Force; Transitional Procedure

§ 17
Entry into Force; Transitional Procedure

This statute enters into force on the day of its announcement in the Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin official gazette.

The responsibility of inquiry panels that have been appointed at this time according to current law, remains unaffected.

This statute has been created using the following sources:

- *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Association): Vorschläge zur Sicherung Guter Wissenschaftlicher Praxis, Empfehlungen der Kommission "Selbstkontrolle in der Wissenschaft" (Suggestions for ensuring good scientific practice, recommendations by the "Self-Control in Science" committee), 1998*
- *Hochschulrektorenkonferenz (German Rectors' Conference): Zum Umgang mit wissenschaftlichem Fehlverhalten in den Hochschulen; Empfehlung des 185. Plenums der Hochschulrektorenkonferenz vom 06. Juli 1998 (On dealing with scientific misconduct in universities: recommendations by the 185. plenary rectors' conference of 6 July 1998)*
- *Grundsätze der Charité zur Sicherung Guter Wissenschaftlicher Praxis (Charité Principles of Ensuring Good Scientific Practice), dated 20 October 2005*
- *Satzung der Universität Ulm zur Sicherung der Guten Wissenschaftlichen Praxis (University of Ulm Statute Ensuring Good Scientific Practice), dated 16 October 2009*
- *Satzung der Universität Leipzig zur Sicherung Guter Wissenschaftlicher Praxis (University of Leipzig Statute Ensuring Good Scientific Practice), dated 9 August 2002*
- *The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity, European Science Foundation und ALLEA (All European Academies), 2011*