

Duke Department of Pathology Scholarly Culture & Accountability Plan

“In recent years, as ongoing globalization, technological advances, and other shifts have transformed research, it is clear that the research enterprise faces new and complex challenges in fostering integrity and in dealing with the consequences of research misconduct and detrimental research practices. Serious cases of research misconduct—including some that have gone undetected for years—continue to emerge with disturbing regularity in the United States and around the world. Increases in the number and percentage of research articles that are retracted and growing concern about low rates of reproducibility in some research fields raise questions about how the research enterprise can better ensure that investments in research produce reliable knowledge.”

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2017. *Fostering Integrity in Research*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. doi: <https://doi.org/10.17226/21896>

As indicated in the text above from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine 2017 report, serious cases of research misconduct, including misconduct committed at Duke, leads many to mistrust science. Additionally, there are many more examples of unreliable findings evidenced by “failures to replicate”. These issues have been publicized highly and necessitate remedies for our practice and culture to enhance the acceptance of scientific results by the public and government leaders.

Duke University is committed to maintaining the highest quality and integrity of its scientific enterprises. Because of this commitment, the School of Medicine (SOM) is required to have mechanisms to guarantee the responsible management and critical review of scientific data. Ensuring the integrity of the research process is analogous to the School’s obligation to ensure lab safety, proper clinical study procedures, and the appropriate use of animals in research. For this reason, the Department of Pathology is committed to ensuring that policies and procedures are in place to reflect the highest professional conduct and to promote a culture in which scientific results are critically reviewed and accountability for data integrity is clearly delineated. In addition, Departmental policies must allow concerns about data integrity to be raised without hesitation and provide a mechanism by which these concerns can be addressed fairly and expeditiously, without retaliation against anyone that raises concerns about data integrity in good faith.

1. PROMOTING A CULTURE OF ACCOUNTABILITY

The Department of Pathology is committed to a culture of scientific accountability. Accordingly, the Departmental leadership is taking steps to support, guide and ensure a culture of scientific integrity, including the mechanisms and actions listed below:

- A. Facilitate discussions of proper scientific conduct at all levels: faculty meetings, lab meetings, and courses, especially focusing on the potential pressures incentivizing deviation from best practices and poor conduct.
- B. Expect all PIs to develop a **“Data Management and Sharing plan”** that will provide specific guidelines for data acquisition, storage, deposition, sharing and transparency. This plan should address the requirements of the NIH data management and sharing policy: <https://sharing.nih.gov/data-management-and->

Duke Department of Pathology Scholarly Culture & Accountability Plan

[sharing-policy](#) that will be required for all NIH grant applications due after January 2023.

- a. A data management and sharing form template is available from the NIH: <https://grants.nih.gov/sites/default/files/DMS-Plan-blank-format-page.pdf>
- C. Ensure all research staff in all laboratories read the Department's Scientific Culture and Accountability Plan and the laboratory-specific Data Management plan.
- D. Expect all faculty, staff, and students active in any research investigation to present their findings at departmental seminars such as the *Pathology Grand Rounds*, the Graduate Student Seminar or some other research seminar. Attending meetings by research faculty is expected to promote an internal culture of mentoring trainees in best practices and open peer review.
- E. Assign formal mentors to new investigators and emphasize the principles outlined above. Strengthen the understanding that adhering to these principles is relevant not only to the pursuit of high quality science knowledge, but also reinforce that laboratory investigation often influences patient care, future studies in humans and development of biomarkers or new drugs.
- F. Promote the sharing of best practices regarding data integrity through a central resource of documents and materials available to all Pathology faculty and trainees. Provide software solutions, analytical support and other resources as appropriate (see links to resources below).
- G. Expect transparency and clear communication from the SOM regarding cases of scientific misconduct that occur at Duke. Understanding details of these cases is critical for preventing similar instances in the future.
- H. Expect all faculty and staff to adhere to Duke guidelines, policies and procedures, including, but not limited to:
 - a. faculty and staff involved with research to complete responsible conduct of research (RCR) training. <https://dosi.duke.edu/RCR>
 - b. Expect all grant principal investigators to complete Stewardship and Compliance for Research Investigators (SCRI) <https://myresearchpath.duke.edu/stewardship-and-compliance-research-investigators-scri-training-series>

2. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

All investigators should keep in mind the adage that: "if it seems too good to be true, then it probably is too good to be true". Scientific data are inherently messy and, as a corollary, data that are too clean may have been "cleaned up". With this in mind, as principal investigators we should follow three general principles:

1. We should know the location of the raw data generated by both laboratory members and any core facilities.
 - Data provenance and integrity ensure that the knowledge we report is supported by the primary data, and that the primary data are retained in a form that allows us to be certain of the accuracy of our knowledge.

Duke Department of Pathology Scholarly Culture & Accountability Plan

2. We should know how data has been acquired, modified and analyzed.
 - Scientific rigor ensures the proper application of the scientific method using the highest standards in the field. Scientific rigor is essential to conduct of the scientific enterprise.
3. We value and encourage constructive critiques of research and allow open discussion of any concerns regarding research conduct or integrity.

While the principal investigators of research projects are responsible for the research performed under their leadership, the guiding principles of scientific research apply to every member of the Department of Pathology. Faculty, trainees, staff and administrators should understand and follow these principles.

3. RECOMMENDED BEST PRACTICES FOR IMPROVING THE CULTURE OF SCIENTIFIC ACCOUNTABILITY WITHIN INDIVIDUAL LABORATORIES

Laboratory research is defined as any investigation using “wet” or “dry” laboratory resources, typically incorporating, but not limited to, data derived from animals, tissues, cells, biochemical or molecular assays, images, informatics analyses of (publicly available) large datasets, novel devices, novel software and novel algorithms applied to data analysis.

Clinical research is defined as any investigation using data derived from patients, including observational research (data from archived sources, including cases, chart reviews, insurance databases and “big data” databases), interactive research (non-risk research on consented participants, including imaging studies, blood draws, tissue swabs, or surveys) and interventional research (potentially risk-involving research involving consenting participants with data derived from active comparison of therapeutic treatments or diagnostic tests). Some clinical research also incorporates principles of laboratory research if performed by Duke investigators (i.e., genetics, biomarkers, informatics analyses).

Best practices in clinical research are generally derived from the Declaration of Helsinki and subsequent guidance documents. The Duke Office for Clinical Research (DOCR) has extensive resources outlining “best clinical practices” for conduct of clinical research, including required CITI modules and Duke-mandated Human Subject Research (HSR) training, as well as many other web-based educational modules. All new clinical investigators should familiarize themselves with these resources and complete the required training. Established investigators should periodically review these policies. Clinical investigators are also encouraged to discuss their proposed studies with the Vice Chair for Research, the Medical Director for the CRU and/or the Clinical Research Practice Manager. The on-boarding process for initiating new studies at Duke incorporates many elements of good clinical practice, especially if the study is a multi-centered federally-funded or industry-funded trial.

The principles below provide guidance for ensuring the integrity of your own data, whether it is laboratory basic science or clinical research involving human subjects. Principal Investigators should discuss these expectations with their research team, and develop explicit processes within their lab to monitor compliance with these policies by developing data management standard operating procedures (SOP). It is expected that Principal

Duke Department of Pathology Scholarly Culture & Accountability Plan

Investigators will review their data management SOP and its implementation at their annual meeting with Department Chair or the Chair's Delegate.

A. Best practices in experimental design

- Have a clearly identified research question or hypothesis.
- Employ both positive and negative controls.
- Employ systematic random sampling for data collection, including but not limited to, selection of areas chosen for sampling (i.e., regions within cells or tissues selected for imaging or analysis).
- Strive to eliminate bias in experimental procedures and analysis. If practical, experimenters should be masked to treatment. Consider balancing the timing of experiments to account for sources of bias over time (e.g. evolution of surgical skills, fatigue, circadian rhythms in experimental animals).
- Utilize multiple methods, techniques or analytic approaches for reproducing and comparing results from your experiments.
- Use replicate samples (to accommodate both technical and biologic variation) for experimental groups, when appropriate.
- Use validated and/or well-characterized reagents (such as antibodies and pharmacological agents), or conduct full validation.
- Consider inherent limitations of human, animal and cellular studies arising from possible contributions of genetic background, gender and other relevant factors.
- When in doubt, cross-train laboratory personnel so that one person can independently verify the results of another.
- When using shared core facilities, both University-based and Department-based, always understand the methodology they employ and critically evaluate the raw data for any results they provide.
- When using archived data, consider dividing your sample into a "training" data set and a validation data set.

B. Best practices in data analysis and statistics

- If significant statistical analysis is needed, consult with a biostatistician both before and after data collection.
 - Duke CTSI Biostatistics, Epidemiology, and Research Design (BERD) Methods Core Resource Request Form
 - <https://redcap.duke.edu/redcap/surveys/?s=X43KKNFLJ7>
- When applicable, determine sample size by pre-experiment power analyses.
- Identify stopping points *a priori* to avoid testing to a foregone conclusion.
- Use care in pooling data across experiments performed at different times or different experimental groups.
- Avoid arbitrary data exclusion. Exclude data only if there is a compelling, transparent and documented reason to do it (e.g. documented error in solution composition, erroneously collected data for the same set at different temperatures, contaminated cell culture, etc.).

Duke Department of Pathology Scholarly Culture & Accountability Plan

C. Best practices in data management

- Comply with the NIH data management and sharing policy: <https://sharing.nih.gov/data-management-and-sharing-policy> that will be required for all NIH grant applications due after January 2023.
 - A data management and sharing form template is available from the NIH: <https://grants.nih.gov/sites/default/files/DMS-Plan-blank-format-page.pdf>
- Develop well-defined and uniform standard operating procedures (SOPs) for documentation of experimental activities. This applies to keeping records in “data notebooks”, data storage, documenting protocols, data modification and analysis.
- Each laboratory member should read and understand the data management SOP. This should be acknowledged in writing prior to performing any research in the lab.
- Retain complete primary data, backed up, and protected against alterations. Confirm with the awards details from the funding agency to determine the length of time data must be retained: https://ori.hhs.gov/education/products/rcradmin/topics/data/tutorial_11.shtml#:~:text=The%20key%20question%20is%20%E2%80%9Cthree,in%20its%20Grants%20Policy%20Statement.
- Alterations and modifications of the primary data should be performed on copies of the data whenever possible, and should be tracked, dated, and described.
- Data notebooks should be available for viewing. Consider performing periodic audits of laboratory notebooks to ensure that a third-party reviewer would be satisfied with the level of documentation provided for an experiment.
- Digital archives should be properly organized and labeled so that they can be audited. The same applies to any data that comes from shared equipment or core facilities.
- Ensure integrity of the data obtained by your collaborators. Personally examine raw data and, when in doubt, perform an independent analysis of data generated by collaborators to verify accuracy.
- The level of information security should be appropriate for the data, especially for human subject protection and personal health information (PHI).
- Data should be accessible to all data owners and, when applicable, available to outside investigators after publication.
- For any investigator with an active IRB protocol(s), complete appropriate CITI modules and HSR training web-based training. It is highly encouraged that investigators (including trainees) complete DOCR’s Informed Consent Process, Data Integrity and Security and Study Documentation training.
- Comply with all SOM and FDA regulatory requirements (i.e., regulatory binders, IRB approvals, etc.).
- All electronic data must be stored on a Duke recognized/approved server. The location of the study data must be clearly reported on the Duke e-IRB section 12.1, Research Data Security Plan (RDSP) and amended as the location of the data is changed. **NO** data should ever be stored on a non-Duke computer.

Duke Department of Pathology Scholarly Culture & Accountability Plan

D. Best practices in publication

- Avoid “rushing” findings into publication without a full investigation and proper self-replication.
- Report full details on methods and experimental design, including technical and biological replicates, methods for randomization and masking, and self-replication efforts.
- Report complete results of all analyses done as part of an experiment, including statistical. It is better for Methods sections to be too long rather than too short.
- Target appropriate journals for publication. Avoid pressure to publish in the most glamorous journal at the expense of following the best practices for experimental design, data analysis and statistics. If a paper requires a long methods section or many figures to document the science thoroughly, do not try to compress it into a short format, no matter how “important” the results seem.
- Attempt to publish well-controlled but negative, “uninteresting,” or “not novel” results in appropriate venues such as PLOS ONE (<https://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/journal-information>); The All Results Journals (<http://arjournals.com/>); ACA OMEGA (<https://pubs.acs.org/journal/acsodf>); F1000Research (<https://f1000research.com/>); Journal of Negative Results in BioMedicine (<https://jnrbm.biomedcentral.com/>).
- Consider submission to another journal if the peer review process demands additional experiments on an abbreviated timeline (an unfortunate emerging trend) because of the associated time pressure and potential for bias (i.e., if the results need to be interpreted to conform to previously-reached conclusions).

E. Creating a functional and proactive scientific culture

- Create a culture of open conversation and willingness to accept internal critiques and challenges of data without retribution.
- Understand that questioning data integrity does not constitute a misconduct accusation.
- Inform all Department staff that they may bring any concerns to the attention of the Vice Chair for Research, the Senior Vice Chair or the Chair without fear of retaliation or retribution. Staff should also be aware of the Duke Integrity Line to report concerns anonymously (see below).
- Principal investigators and laboratory heads should be actively involved in laboratory procedures, should oversee some of the actual experimental work, and should “know” how things are done in their laboratory.
- Principal investigators and laboratory heads must recognize that although laboratory research is motivated by the pursuit of true knowledge, certain incentives or pressures (or the appearance thereof) may influence their staff to deviate from best practices, especially based on concerns about academic promotion, choice of publication venue, grant submission deadlines or competition with other labs.

Duke Department of Pathology Scholarly Culture & Accountability Plan

- Issues of proper scientific conduct and scientific rigor should be discussed with staff regularly, in both private and group settings.
- Laboratory meetings with staff should include inspection of some primary data and discussion of detailed analysis procedures, as well as discussion of final publication-style figures.

4. DEPARTMENT OF PATHOLOGY RESEARCH INTEGRITY CONTACTS

Dr. Herman Staats, Vice Chair of Research and the Research Quality Officer (RQO) is responsible for maintaining the Department of Pathology Scholarly culture and Accountability Plan (SCAP).

- The SCAP is meant to be a “living document” that changes to improve its content. Dr. Staats will meet with Pathology researchers (faculty, staff, students, trainees, etc.) to discuss the guiding principles above.
- Department of Pathology members may contact Dr. Staats to discuss or propose changes to the Department of Pathology SCAP.

Any questions, comments or concerns should be addressed to the following individuals:

- Dr. Herman Staats, Ph.D., Vice Chair of Research (herman.staats@duke.edu)
- Dr. David Howell, Senior Vice Chair (howel015@duke.edu)
- Department Chair, Dr. Jiaoti Huang (jiaoti.huang@duke.edu)

Resources at Duke in addition to the Department of Pathology Contacts:

1. The anonymous Duke Integrity Line: 1-800-826-8109
2. Advancing Scientific Integrity, Services and Training Office (ASIST); <https://dosi.duke.edu/ASIST>
3. Duke Office of Scientific Integrity: <https://dosi.duke.edu/>
4. Duke Animal Care and Use Program: <https://ors.duke.edu/grants-contracts-and-compliance-responsible-conduct-rcr-university-policies/animal-care-and-use>
5. Duke Office of Clinical Research: <https://medschool.duke.edu/research/research-support/research-support-offices/duke-office-clinical-research-docr>
6. Duke Office for Institutional Equity: <https://oie.duke.edu/>
7. Duke Health Institutional Review Board: <https://irb.duhs.duke.edu/>
8. Data management plan support:
 - Research Data Management support: <https://library.duke.edu/data/data-management>
 - Duke Office of Scientific Integrity support for data management plans; <https://dosi.duke.edu/advancing-scientific-integrity-services-and-training/accountability-research/data-management-plan>
 - Data Management Plan tool: <https://dmptool.org/>

Duke Department of Pathology Scholarly Culture & Accountability Plan

- a Data Management Planning Tool from the University of California. Duke employees can sign on through the institutional login and use one of the shared DMP templates or create their own.
9. Responsible Conduct of Research training for faculty and staff: <https://dosi.duke.edu/RCR>
 10. Stewardship and Compliance for Research Investigators (SCRI): <https://myresearchpath.duke.edu/stewardship-and-compliance-research-investigators-scri-training-series>
 11. MyResearchPath: The roadmap for navigating research policy, process, and resources at Duke University; <https://myresearchpath.duke.edu/>

Duke Department of Pathology Scholarly Culture & Accountability Plan

Best Practices Checklist for Researchers

Research Integrity

- Maintain high standards in own work
- Understand policies.
- Raise questions and problems promptly and professionally.
- Strive to be a generous and collegial colleague.

Data Handling

- Develop data management and sharing plan at the outset of a project.
- Incorporate appropriate data management expertise in the project team.
- Understand and follow data collection, management, and sharing standards, policies, and regulations of the discipline, institution, funder, journal, and relevant government agencies.

Authorship and Communication

- Ensure that general and disciplinary standards are followed for research publications.
- Acknowledge the roles and contributions of authors.
- Be transparent when communicating with all audiences.

Mentoring and Supervision

- Model and instruct on research best practices.
- Regularly check work of subordinates and ensure adherence to best practices.
- Clarify expectations.

Peer Review

- Provide complete and timely review.
- Maintain confidentiality.
- Disclose conflicts and eliminate or manage them as appropriate.

Research Compliance

- Protect human subjects and laboratory animals.
- Follow environmental and other safety regulations
- Do not engage in misuse
- Disclose and manage conflicts of interest.

Reproduced from Chapter 9, *Identifying and Promoting Best Practices for Research Integrity*, National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2017. *Fostering Integrity in Research*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. doi: <https://doi.org/10.17226/21896> .

Duke Department of Pathology Scholarly Culture & Accountability Plan

5. ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

- Cromey DW. Avoiding twisted pixels: ethical guidelines for the appropriate use and manipulation of scientific digital images. *Science and engineering ethics*. 2010;16(4):639-67. Epub 2010/06/23. doi: 10.1007/s11948-010-9201-y. PubMed PMID: 20567932; PMCID: PMC4114110.
 - <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4114110/>
- Online Learning Tool for Research Integrity and Image Processing
 - <https://ori.hhs.gov/education/products/RlandImages/default.html>
- Power calculations
 - <http://powerandsamplesize.com/>
 - <https://www.bu.edu/researchsupport/compliance/animal-care/working-with-animals/research/sample-size-calculations-iacuc/>
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2017. *Fostering Integrity in Research*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. doi:
 - <https://doi.org/10.17226/21896>
- Vaux DL, Fidler F, Cumming G. Replicates and repeats--what is the difference and is it significant? A brief discussion of statistics and experimental design. *EMBO Rep*. 2012;13(4):291-6.
 - <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3321166/>
- National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, Institute of Medicine Panel on Scientific, Responsibility the Conduct of Research. *Responsible Science: Ensuring the Integrity of the Research Process: Volume I*. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US). Copyright (c) 1992 by the National Academy of Sciences.; 1992.
- National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, Institute of Medicine Panel on Scientific, Responsibility the Conduct of Research. *Responsible Science: Ensuring the Integrity of the Research Process: Volume II*. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US). Copyright 1993 by the National Academy of Sciences. All rights reserved.; 1993.
- Duke Misconduct in Research Office
 - <https://dosi.duke.edu/misconduct-research>
 - https://provost.duke.edu/sites/default/files/FHB_App_P.pdf#page=32
- Scientific Culture and Accountability Plans from other Duke Departments
 - Ophthalmology: <http://dukeeyecenter.duke.edu/research/duke-department-ophthalmology-science-culture-accountability-plan> (used as a template for the Pathology SCAP).
 - Neurobiology: <https://www.neuro.duke.edu/sites/default/files/2022-01/NeuroSCAP2020.pdf>
 - Medicine: <https://medicine.duke.edu/research/science-culture-and-accountability>
- ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT GLOBAL SCIENCE FORUM. *Best Practices for Ensuring Scientific Integrity and Preventing Misconduct* <https://www.oecd.org/science/inno/40188303.pdf>

Duke Department of Pathology Scholarly Culture & Accountability Plan

- PROTECTING THE INTEGRITY OF GOVERNMENT SCIENCE
[https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/01-22-Protecting the Integrity of Government Science.pdf](https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/01-22-Protecting-the-Integrity-of-Government-Science.pdf)
- How to Conduct Responsible Research: A Guide for Graduate Students
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8277481/pdf/nihms-1711539.pdf>
- Good practice from the grass roots. Community-led efforts — not just global ones — are key to research integrity <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-03782-z>
- Scientific Integrity Principles and Best Practices: Recommendations from a Scientific Integrity Consortium.
<https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s11948-019-00094-3.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office of Research Integrity case summaries https://ori.hhs.gov/content/case_summary
 - This page contains cases in which administrative actions were imposed due to findings of research misconduct. The list only includes those who CURRENTLY have an imposed administrative actions against them. It does NOT include the names of individuals whose administrative actions periods have expired. Each case is categorized according to the year in which ORI closed the case.
 - Duke case: <https://ori.hhs.gov/content/case-summary-potts-kant-erin-n>
 - UNC case: <https://ori.hhs.gov/content/case-summary-magnuson-terry>
- Federal Register. Findings of Research Misconduct.
 - Duke case: <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2015/11/09/2015-28437/findings-of-research-misconduct>