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I'm good I'll just quickly introduce you so you don't mind and just takes up to

today so great so hi should I go ahead are we ready to go okay so hi everybody

I'm Peter Schwartz I'm the director of the IU Center for Bioethics and of the

bioethics and subject advocacy program of the Indiana CTSI and this is the next

episode our next installment of our monthly treats series the translational

research ethics applied topics these are meant to be short introductions to key

issues in research ethics that are applicable and useful to people who are conducting research and might have a

question about it they're meant to be introductory rather than an academic talk of course we do have such qualified

and expert people they often throw in cutting-edge knowledge and information but again we want you to walk away from

this with an understanding of some of the current thinking and current issues as they apply perhaps your own research

and then if you have further questions you can contact any of us me and Ty yoga

or the main contacts for the piece a program we also top you know it's true

or not you give me a thumbs up or not that we are going to soon have the BSAP at IU.edu email

I hope so you can just always email to the B step program that way in an easy way we are thrilled to have dr.

Soto here today to present to us on academic misconduct Dr. Sotto has been a member of BSAP for the last few years a

very important member bringing to us a lot of experience in research ethics and

also in running IRB's and research regulation that other universities

before IU and so we've been very lucky to have her inside and help she is also

and prepped more importantly the vice chair for faculty affairs development and diversity in medicine and an

assistant professor in our department and her work is very important in the area of ethics and in research ethics

and of course throughout medicine in the society relating to diversity and

discrimination and medicine and society and so we've been thrilled to have her as a faculty member and BSAP and

thrilled to have her speak to us today so Dr. Sotto hey well thank you very much

I will go ahead and share the screen now and okay

you see this okay give me a thumbs up if

you can see it it's one of those bingo things so thank you very much for the

introduction Peter I am happy to join all of you today I will talk about

research misconduct and yes I will mention kovat 19 I was trying to come up

with a clever name for a title for this talk and I just felt that that pretty

much summarized it so as Peter said I am

Sylk Sotto and I am a proud member of BSAP for this talk I will just focus on

the high-level overview of what research misconduct is the vast majority of us

are definitely engaged in in research and we want to do the right thing we

want to do it right we want to carefully design studies we want to take into

consideration obviously research ethics we want to properly carry out the studies and report results in order that

advance that scientific and medical knowledge so this is what we will do

indeed today we will do a little bit of oversight in terms of who's in charge we

will define research misconduct and as I do with our students I like to discuss

the top retractions and for today I will present a little bit in terms of

pandemic versus paper Demick and what has happened during this koban 19

pandemic in relation to possibilities or opportunities unfortunate opportunities

for research misconduct so who has oversight of research

misconduct of course the Office of Research integrity oversees all research

integrity activities on behalf of the public health public health services in

the Secretary of Health and Human Services with the exception of FDA so it

is codified under 42 CFR 93 which is you

know how US research compliance officers often communicate and at IU we have a

research misconduct policy which applies to everybody that holds university appointments and graduate students but

it's also important to know that for undergraduates involved in research and this actually goes into the code of

student rights responsibilities and in conduct and the reason why I mentioned students is because sometimes they are

involved in this kind of situation and we need to know where to go in order to

report these instances so what is research misconduct so research

misconduct means the fabrication falsification or plagiarism in proposing

or performing research or reviewing research and reporting these research results the fabrication is making up

data of results and recording or reporting them falsification is that manipulation of research specific

research materials equipment or process changing or emitting data or results

such that that it in at the end research is not accurately represented in the

research record and plagiarism is the appropriation of another person's ideas

processes results for words without giving appropriate credit in general research misconduct does not

include honest error a much less differences of opinion I want to discuss

briefly and at least make a comment about the plagiarism piece because as

you will note it says that it's appropriation of another person's ideas

and indeed a research misconduct policy does not cover things like plagiarism so

with that said here are some comments about self plagiarism as we found out

that it would be an important topic of discussion as well with our students so

like I said self plagiarism is not specifically talked about in 42 CFR 493

the research misconduct policy but in general it refers to authors who reuse

their own previously disseminated content and pass it off as new product without letting the readers know that

this material has appeared previously somewhere and this is actually

guidelines set out that pretty much say that when you submit

things to the journal that you must indicate previous dissemination if the

results of a single complex study our best presented as a cohesive one then

you shouldn't necessarily submit individual papers about individual parts

of that study that you should be aware that plagiarized materials may constitute copyright infringement so

even if you are repeating the literature review over and over and over again that

you may still have to be aware of those because of that copyright infringement

the previous journal actually owns that material and to avoid reusing their own

previously published text unless it is cited so you can still use the text that

are you know important in relevant to your study but just remember to cite it

a lot of institutions including IU the plagiarism also includes using work that

has been already submitted by you perhaps in an assignment and that's why

I wanted to mention the undergrad and cried in grad students they recognize self plagiarism so and this is the case

for many other higher education institutions in which yes safety sure is amount

as misconduct per their policies so as I

mentioned I like to discuss these tougher attractions that are usually set forward by retraction watch and there

are they are a watch group that has been doing this for eons actually looking at

these retractions and actually at the end of the year they provide a list of these so I thought I would share with

you a few of these that have actually come out and when I say few I say over

1433 retractions that they actually reported in 2019

I actually just include briefly here what some of these are obviously issues

around figures nature just had recently one of the bigger cases that were

retracted in 2019 was because of figures when we are in the classroom we actually

try to look at PCR slides and western blots to see where the students actually

see that difference innocent bystander I said New England Journal of Medicine because the initial article was reported

in nature and then anything that is subsequently cited then gets affected

and in this case New England Journal of Medicine also had to retract Duke is one

of my favorite institutions and unfortunately when I talk about research misconduct I hope nobody in the group

here will hold that against me but I say that saga continues so late recently in

2019 potts you can't have to actually do their 18th retraction and costing Duke

about again over a hundred and twelve million dollars fabrication cases show

up in science and nature of course coding errors happen especially when

we're talking about big data and scripts and things of that nature and obviously

conflict of interest the peer review pirates are is referred to as a term

that is referred to instances in which the reviewers of your article actually hijacked it and they

use it as part of their own studies their own papers and things of that nature and that was certainly something

that happened in 2019 if you're

interested in how journals are you know report these retractions this is just a

snapshot as of Tuesday of this week of nature and you can see there that they

list all the retractions they have had throughout the year so I want to talk

about the pandemic I know that wasn't necessarily a very smooth transition but one of the lessons about the pandemic

and these retractions in journals come actually from you all the lessons

actually talked about the body of inconclusive findings talking a little

bit about despite this sense of urgency research during the epidemic is still

subject to the same core scientific and ethical requirements that govern

all research on human subjects that even there's some exigencies of crisis

situations like global pandemics we still require exceptional steps to combine effort and divided labor and

triage out the low value and duplicative results this is critical because we have

seen this during the Kohen 19 pandemic it's almost like it's repeating itself

so the authors of this paper let's see

here just appeared in science recently talked about against pandemic research

exceptionalism in critical situations large randomized control trials are not

always feasible or ethical but crisis situations demand exceptions to high

standards for quality early phase studies have been launched before completion of investigations that would

normally be required to warrant further development of the intervention and treatment trials have used research

strategies that are easy to implement but unlikely to yield unbiased

effect estimate so we go now to talk a

little bit about the situation when it comes to hydroxychloroquine I'm sure

that I don't have to talk much about

hydroxychloroquine but it's important to note that in this same article they talk about 18 clinical trials of various

hydroxychloroquine based regimes and enrolling over 75,000 patients just in

North America despite limited evidence supporting the efficacy of that anti-malaria drug in the treatment of

coronavirus one of the things the authors highlight is that there is a

huge amount of duplication in the testing that is just not happening or

that is happening not just in North America this is important because it

means that we're doing similar work and taking advantage of it and the journals

and the research Enterprise is not handling it very well as of June 15th we

know that FDA finally revoked the authorization for hydric locks hydroxy

chlorine as koban 19 treatments this was just done basically a few days ago

citing poor effectiveness and severe side effects but on April of 2020 NIH

had already issued guidance on these options saying there was an is there was insufficient data to recommend this use

I think it's something that we need to be quite aware of not just because of

perhaps it doesn't quite fit the definition of research misconduct right

now but it might be something that would welcome the same way but it has been a

situation and many other is is of large pandemics like this so this

pandemic faces paper demic it's actually a term used in this recent article when

it talks about science ranging from robust studies to dishonest studies conducted and posted and shared at

unprecedented rates which has been the case for a lot of the covert science

speech science has become very troubling as it includes bad science with a lot of

peers commenting on the lack of reliability of the research results the

ongoing fast peer review process and covert 19 is potentially damaging to

science of course compromising the research integrity in actually you know

leading into that research misconduct so covid 19 has shortened that time to a

few days of several cases and in this one in particular is one of these in

which the fact was dated on March 14 the article was submitted on March 16 it was

accepted into the journal by March 17 and published online on March 20th that

is definitely record breaking peer

review so who is actually you know the

victim at the end of the day we see obviously that there's a race to publish

we have seen also a remarkable increase in journal preprints I think actually

the last data that I saw where the preprint sites had actually gone over

3,000 had received over 3,000 submissions more than usual so those

preprint sites have been really trying to work hard and trying to you know weed

out bad science but needless to say people are still using those databases I

like to as I'm in faculty affairs I want to obviously point out that this pressure

to publish sometimes really has a strong

effect on research misconduct that desire of actually publishing something

so you can actually be promoted and being that that tenure track and of

course you know human subjects and ethics committee that sometimes we may have not paid the attention that we

needed in order to give that give those studies the proper review many

organizations urge the research community to risk again to respect the highest integrity standards and we need

to remember that at the end of the day you know our populations victims are

actually people since it wouldn't be me if I didn't mention culturally competent

research which is also something that I spent time talking about I just would like to highlight at least in this

victims equal society that we have seen obviously communities of color greatly

affected by covert but research misconduct and obviously has led to

horrific examples in research ethics

throughout history so what not slide went a little bit crazy there

but I wanted to highlight how obviously black adults are more hesitant to trust medical scientists embrace the use of

you know experimental medical treatments and obviously signing up for potential

vaccines to combat the illness and they have already been asked about this in a

June 4th study where black Americans said no we might not actually

participate in vaccine in all these

things related to kovat which is very sad when we know that these communities of color are greatly affected but that

is a result of research misconduct this is another data piece that actually came

from nature in which they talking about the average number of days between submission and publication and

there you can see that drastic you know switch between how long it's taking to

review these studies let's see here

so recently The Lancet the New England Journal of Medicine retracted

controversial covert 19 studies this one

specifically hydroxychloroquine with or without macrolide for treatment of colon

19 was actually multinational registry

analysis it was actually a study that expressed great concern from the very

beginning it relied on data from a private company called searches fear and

had concluded that hydroxychloroquine was linked to a higher risk of death

among some common 19 patients some of

the complaints about the study actually led to some Corrections but the authors

weren't able to actually share the data and much less replicate the results so

you know the the journal Lancet actually retracted it and it was obviously a

high-profile retraction scientists if it wasn't for scientists like you who raise

questions and the paper's authors this probably wouldn't have been retracted

again because of The Lancet retraction New England Journal of

Medicine actually pull within the following I think it was within an hour

also retracted paper that they have published based on Lancet on The

Lancet paper so with that let's see here I don't know where my mouse is okay so

with that I would like to and open it to questions and answers but telling

you where to report on research misconduct if you see it take place at

India University again the Office of Research integrity is the federal office in which

you can certainly submit anonymous tips but also at IU you can report the

concerns based on the research integrity or to the research integrity officer and

that information is listed here so you can so you know where to go in order to

report research misconduct with that I will take any questions and hope we have

a good discussion about research misconduct I can't hear you Peter if

you're talking I said questions for dr.

Soto I have bio 5 but I cannot start I will defer Thomas well that's one to get

things started I'm going to stop for my other four so hey first of all so it's a great talk really appreciate it as

everybody knows these sweet talks will be you know archived on our website for

people wanting to learn about this conduct I love that you use the pandemic I know that sort of some of you speak

about because it's in our it's in our face right now and I liked about how you emphasized it as a societal and

structural issue with the pandemic just like it is with misconduct more

generally I thought I might just talk that back to you and it's emphasized that for the viewers either here or on the recording you know that we usually

pointing out as a tremendous pressure normally in a normal world to publish a lot to get things out there immediately

so that your next grant is ready for submission etc. and that's it of course what leads to the kind of break

fragrant I was going to say because it smells bad I met flagrant you know violations of research ethics which

count as misconduct which you looked at the beginning so I thought it would speak a little

more about if you have any insight or thoughts on are we making products one of course the take-home messages don't

do it right if you're a researcher and you're attempted to cut a corner be very

aware that you can cut a corner too tightly and be conducting something which will actually be very poor for the

impact of the science to the public and for the impact on your own life and when you've got a question about whether

what you're doing is misconduct you can you can reach out to somebody I will

tell the be SAP program bioethics of the EPI program has is a confidential service and some of the things look ah I

wonder kind of publish this and this I'd like your opinion on that the BSAP program can give you a opinion to you

confidentially if you're disclosing actual misconduct you've already performed then we as officer the

university have to report it so right if you have questions about what counts in this con and what doesn't we are happy to help but go back to the first thing I

was saying societal driven we love to point the finger at the researcher and

say you are bad you did misconduct but in fact there's some you know

responsibility or a causal causation

that comes from the structure of our research system thoughts on that and

how you think about misconduct are given that yeah I definitely think that and we

have this discussion in in class when we're talking about research misconduct I do think that there the way that we

have set up the structure for funding the structure for research funding the

structures for academic productivity the structures for promotion and tenure and

the list goes on and on right is not just us academic I do think that it contributes to the pressure and all

these instances in which research misconduct is listed especially when

you're looking at these retractions when you're looking at the reputation and the

status of research one institution which is a you know designation that pressure is bound to be

there what I also spend a lot of time speaking with the students it's on the

mentorship side because we do see a lot of this also happen in these research

misconduct findings if you go to the Office of Research integrity to look at this you will see a lot of postdocs

involved a lot of PhD students you will see PIs who would say I didn't do it I

didn't know about it you know it was my postdoc who took the notebook home and

so I think that in terms of institutions we should also hold accountable our

faculty in their mentoring and many times when I saw this previous from IU I

at the end of the day I was having a hard time not blaming the mentors for

the mistakes of the students for the mistakes of the Graduate you know or the

postdoc because I do see that our efforts need to be increased in that

mentoring in in letting know our students and our postdocs you know what

is actually what actually constitutes research misconduct where to go at the same time we also see from them the

pressure of thinking oh my PI might not be doing something right but I don't

know where to go to say anything like that because my career depends on that P

I so there's a lot of this situations and I do believe that it's at the end of

the day it might be more structural than the individuals desire to actually do

wrong do something wrong does that answer your question Peter

okay so Larry Gretel here I'm you're

talking about this I'm thinking about it in the context the bigger context of just academic misconduct when we talk

about researchers at a university you've mentioned and you've talked about the students as well but I too agree that

we're talking about you have to look at the mentors as models and you have to look the impact on the students for not

picking up on this kind of stuff yeah it's tough to do but I it causes me to

think about the conversations of B searcheth ass and the relationship of

the researchers misconduct to the student potential for misconduct in a

classroom environment t same things apply there's rewards for punitive

rewards for wanting to do something that's inappropriate without I think without many times recognizing the risk

that's a that's it's apparent with that I think there's a lot a lot of parallels here I agree I agree and you know just

to go a little bit further so you know I've made a joke about Duke who always which is obviously a very well respected

institution but this keeps happening they keep being in the news yet we still

think about Duke as you know one of those gold standards and research and

that is not to say that we're judging the whole institution by you know one or two peers but this is definitely not I

would say it is a trajectory I think because it has been going on so I again

I don't mean to pick on Duke but when you look at academic institutions and

you look at the research misconduct and what it has cost them I think

recent when maybe it was just ten years ago which today will be even more that estimate was actually a hunt around a

hundred and ten million dollars that actually cost academic institutions this

research misconduct so I think the costs are in in and in and out of research and

in and outside the classroom as well

any other questions or comments I don't have all the answers but I'm happy to

chat with

he does one chat here oh so quick you would chat about anybody else with

questions but making the proper understanding of it I'm going to

personally thank Larry for showing us the blue side that he was bragging about earlier okay anybody else yeah that is a

very nice background