Responsible Conduct of Research 2: Getting Ready for Submission of Manuscripts and Thesis

Mandatory assignment

Dear PhD student,
In order to complete the course and to prepare you for submission of your PhD thesis in the near future, you must answer the following questions to the best of your ability and submit the assignment to Absalon. As a point of reference, choose either your PhD thesis or a paper you aim to submit to a journal in the near future. We expect your answers to amount to a few lines per question.

1. **Your PhD thesis/your paper**
   a. What field of study (or fields of study) does your PhD thesis/paper pertain to?

   b. Describe the aim of your PhD thesis/paper in 3-5 lines.

2. **The relevant journal**
Find the journal in which you aim to publish your paper, or a journal in which you intent to publish part of your thesis.
   a. What is the scientific scope of the journal?

   b. How does your work fit in to the scientific scope of the journal?

   c. Is the journal trustworthy? Why? Why not?

3. **Issues of plagiarism and duplicated text**
   a. Are quotes easily seen as quotes in your PhD thesis/paper, and do you quote in a consistent manner throughout your PhD thesis/paper?

   b. Do you re-cycle text in your PhD thesis/paper? Do you copy and paste text you have written yourself in other papers (or in your master thesis) into your paper/PhD thesis?
   If so, do you quote yourself?
   If you paraphrase yourself, do you refer to yourself?

   c. Plagiarism does not only concern text, but also e.g. images and figures. In your PhD paper/thesis, do you refer to the source whenever you present an image/figure that is not of your own creation?

4. **Open Access Issues**
Find the website of the journal in which you aim to publish your paper, or a journal in which you intent to publish part of your thesis. Consider the following:

   a. Are there potential conflicts between the policy of the journal and the requirement of your PhD thesis being publicly available? If yes, explain how you will handle it. If no, why not?

   b. Does your funding source or employer require or encourage the use of open access? If so, explain in 2-3 lines what you will do to honour it.

It may be relevant to check the journals policy on pre-print, post-print, and embargo. Pre-print usually means a version of your paper prior to peer review. Post-print usually means a version of your paper after peer reviewed, but not the publisher's version. Embargo is usually the time from publication until the journal allows you to share publicly a post-print version of your paper. However, there may be differences from journal to journal, so check your journal for the right definition.

5. **Authorship Issues**
   a. Have you added all authors, and only all authors, to the byline of your paper (or chapters of your dissertation) in accordance with Vancouver Recommendations? Why/why not?

   b. Give a short description of the contribution of each author and why it qualifies to authorship.

   c. Are there scholars you have considered adding to your byline, but have not added? Why?

   d. Do you acknowledge scholars who have contributed to your paper/thesis, but who do not qualify as authors? What were their contribution? Did you ask for their permission?

6. **Conflicts of interest**
   a. Declare your conflicts of interest in regards to your paper/thesis, if any.

   b. Describe your considerations about any conflicts of interest you ended up not declaring above.

   c. Often journals require you to declare your conflicts of interest. Have you considered declaring them in your PhD thesis, e.g. in the foreword? Why/why not?

7. **Materials, Data and Code Management**
    a. Have you made a plan for managing newly created primary materials (biological or physical materials, notes, interviews, texts and literature, recordings, etc.) including details on how materials can be accessed and describing any restriction on access? Why/why not?

    b. If you have worked with animals, what guidelines have you consulted and which permissions have you received?

    c. If you have worked human research participants, what guidelines have you consulted and which permissions have you received? How do you anonymize the data and where do you keep the informed consent?

    d. Did you make a data management plan in the first year of your PhD? If no, why not?

    e. Do you have a data availability statement indicating whether datasets are available, including specific protocols for access or restriction on access? Why/why not?

    f. Do you reuse publicly available data? Where have you provided the identifiers and citations?

    g. Code sharing is important for the reproducibility of your study. Do you have a dedicated Code Availability Statement? Why/why not?

    h. If you have shared your code via a persistent identifier, a DOI, or a URL, have you checked that the code referenced is readily executable by reviewers?

8. **(Ethical) Permissions**
    a. Which of the following institutions have given permission for your study? Explain why.
        - Regional/National Committee on Health Research Ethics
        - Danish Medicines Agency
        - Danish Patient Safety Authority
        - The Danish Working Environment Authority
        - The Animal Experiments Inspectorate
        - Faculty Secretariat, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Copenhagen
        - Research Ethics Committee of Science and Health, University of Copenhagen

    b. How do you plan to document the permissions required for and granted to the project your study is part of in your paper or in your thesis? You may find advice at the journals webpage.

9. **Other issues**
    a. Did you consider and have you talked to your supervisor and other partners about your work responsibilities in regards to publication of (further) articles after your PhD project? (For example if you receive an 'accepted with minor revision' feedback from a journal you submitted a paper to while you were still a PhD student. Who shall revise and re-submit the paper?)

    b. What have you done or will do to make sure your English is correct (linguistically fluent etc.) in your paper/PhD thesis?

    c. Do you consider your thesis/paper to be a piece of responsibly conducted research?

Assessment

The assignment will be assessed by teachers from the course within two weeks after the assignment deadline (the month of July is exempted). Assignments will be marked in Absalon by the assessor as either 'Complete' (√) or 'Incomplete'(X). It is your responsibility to check in Absalon whether you need to re-submit.

Non-satisfactory assignment

If the assignment is marked 'Incomplete', you will receive written comments (in Absalon) on how to improve the assignment. Within two weeks hereafter, you must submit a revised assignment to Absalon and inform the relevant teacher of the resubmission, including information on which course you attended.

You have three attempts to pass the assignment. If the assignment is not passed after three attempts, you must take the RCR2 course again. Failure to meet a deadline results in a failed attempt.

To ensure a fair assessment, all non-satisfactory assignments will be evaluated by two teachers. The assignment and the course are governed by the PhD rules and regulations at SCIENCE.

Confidentiality

Assignments are confidential for all other than the assessors and the course directors and course organisers. If a PhD student files a complaint of the assessment, other staff may also read the assignment to be able to assess the complaint. If an alleged case of scientific misconduct is described in the assignment, the assessors and the course directors may forward the assignment to the university management, after consultation with the PhD student.

When all assignments have been graded, they will be deleted from Absalon.

Questions

Questions about the assignment must be directed to the course lecturer. For any other questions about the RCR2 course, please contact the course administration.