



NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 2022

Dear <<First Name>>,

We are delighted to welcome you to the November/December 2022 edition of the *Research Ethics Monthly*. This is a free publication for the Human Research Ethics, Research Integrity and Animal Ethics community. We produce and distribute this publication thanks to the generous support of our patrons (see below for more details).

We would be thrilled if you would consider becoming a patron of this publication. If you are willing to do so, FANTASTIC! Please contact us at patron@ahrecs.vip to discuss.

If you are a subscriber to this publication, your name should appear above (any errors, please let us know). If you are not named, or know someone who might like to receive the *Research Ethics Monthly*, please subscribe yourself, or encourage your associate to do so (there is a subscription form on the [Blog page](#)); this enhances our ability to provide quality content. It's free and we generally only send one email every month.

Do you have an idea for a story in the REM? Even if you don't want to write it yourself, we would be delighted to hear from you. Drop us a line at researchethicsmonthly@ahrecs.com to discuss. We would be thrilled to hear from you.

More information about *Research Ethics Monthly* can be found on the [Blog page](#). Also, there are links to our previous editions all the way back to May 2015.

You can support this publication by becoming an institutional patron (\$350/year) or an individual patron (from USD2/month). Email us at patron@ahrecs.vip if you want to discuss this. We hate to ask, but your support would make a huge difference to us. We can issue institutions a tax invoice for your subscription.

Whatever your religious, spiritual or scientific beliefs, the AHRECS team wishes you a safe and happy holiday season. We will continue working over the holiday period (insert your own reference to Ebenezer Scrooge here). We do not anticipate producing a December edition of the REM.



Setting the right tone

Gary Allen

The Chairs of research ethics committees play a number of essential roles, included in these is setting the right tone for a meeting. This includes showing respect and courtesy to all members (such as not speaking over them, being calm and respectful and avoiding language that may lead to bias in the review process or decision outcome). The Chair helps to set and maintain the tone of the meetings.

The Chair can and should urge members to be clear and concise in their comments. They should also encourage members away from technical language, acronyms or abbreviations, or where technical language is unavoidable, the terms should be carefully explained, so that all members can understand. The principle is that the lay members of the committee should have sufficient clarity of understanding that they help to make decisions with confidence. The Chair's role is key to this.

Good meeting procedure includes having a standard slot in the agenda where members update their current disclosure of interests, especially as it relates to the meeting agenda and the current work of the committee.

There should also be a slot in the agenda where the committee is provided with an update with regard to researcher professional development that has been conducted since the last meeting. That spot in the agenda affords the Chair the opportunity to express that members should feel free to disclose conflicts whenever they become apparent during the course of the committee's business.

Read more

Making effective use of the cartoons from our Friday Arvo Funnies page

<https://www.linkedin.com/showcase/53189674/>

They may not always leave you rolling on the floor laughing, but generally they will all prompt a smirk and make you think about an important issue in the Human Research Ethics, Research Integrity, or Animal Ethics space.

For the last couple of years, we have been adding new material to this page most Fridays. In addition to being posted to our [LinkedIn page](#), we have also been posting them to our [Facebook page](#). There are a couple of ways you can use this material:

1. As an icebreaker at the start of an event – we have often found a bit of self-deprecation a helpful way to start a professional development activity.
2. To break up sequences of content slides, especially if the material is dry.
3. As the launching board for discussion activities – we have added several of these to <https://www.ahrecs.vip> and <https://www.patreon.com/ahrecs>, which our patrons are free to modify and use.

Our main point is that amusement can be a great way to engage with people in a space that too often can be adversarial.



Is having alternate/reserve members a helpful practice?

Erich von Dietze

Finding, inducting, and retaining quality members to serve on Human Research Ethics Committees and/or Animal Ethics Committees is not an easy task.

Recruiting people for some membership categories can be more straightforward e.g. recruiting researchers who often probably have a vested interest in supporting other researchers. However, people representing other membership categories (especially those categories which require specialist knowledge, or which involve recruiting people from outside the institution) tend to be more difficult to recruit. Then there is the time it takes individuals to become sufficiently experienced in the process of the committee and the types of applications to feel they are making a valuable contribution. Committee administrators tend to take one of three approaches to the need to recruit new members.

1. The committee has only the required number of members as defined by the respective Code.
2. The committee has some 'standby' or alternate members who can be called on to substitute for absences.
3. The committee has two or more members representing each category to help ensure as far as possible that there is full representation at every meeting.

Each of these three models has benefits and risks, each needing to be developed to suit the needs of the particular institution's research profile and committee.

Read more

“There’s a... problem”

Since the early 20th Century, there has been the annoying and unhelpful practice of using research ethics and research integrity concepts to thwart endeavours and efforts in novel areas of practice.

For example, “There is an ethics problem”, “There is a consent problem”, “There is a privacy problem” and “There is a conflicts of interest problem”.

Don't misunderstand us, when these statements are banded around there are often genuine and sometimes serious issues that need to be addressed. Our frustration is not that there are no challenges, it is that the presence of those challenges should be the start of a careful discussion, not the end of a promising idea.

We are de-platforming

We have made the decision to leave the Twitter social media platform. We strongly believe that any company that will tolerate Nazis and hate groups is not something that we want AHRECS to be associated with.

Some of the recent comments by the “Chief Twit” have been pretty repugnant and vile. So we are delighted to leave them behind.

Given that we have never purchased advertising from Twitter, we suspect that they won't care about us leaving, but we can't imagine circumstances where we would go back to them.

While you are here...

Did you enjoy this edition? Would you like to support the work we do? If so, please consider helping us cover the cost of matters such as hosting the Research Ethics Monthly and other web development by becoming an AHRECS Patron.

In addition to the warm glow received from supporting our work, you will be subscribed for monthly updates of useful material (such as resources for use in your local workshops).

INSTITUTION
Subscriptions for institutions cost \$350/year. A tax invoice will be provided. Payments can be made by credit card, over the phone, EFT, or via PayPal. To become a patron, email patron@ahrecs.vip

INDIVIDUAL
Subscriptions start at USD2/month and USD25/month gives you access to all materials. See <https://www.patreon.com/ahrecs>

A few profiled items from the subscribers' area:

01. A tracking sheet for research ethics committee members - [A Human Research Ethics resource](#)
02. The research ethics review of clinical trials is not a race - [Human Research Ethics discussion activity](#)
03. A scary recruiter - [A Human Research Ethics discussion activity](#)
04. Who is he? – [Human Research Ethics \(clinical trials\) commentary](#)
05. Ethical and responsible recruitment of researchers – [A Research Integrity/Human Research Ethics commentary](#)
06. A warm up activity – [A Human Research Ethics discussion activity](#)
07. Acting on 'soft' research misconduct – [A Research Integrity commentary – A Research Integrity commentary](#)
08. Chasing a non-responsive researcher – [A Human Research Ethics commentary](#)
09. How to avoid passive-aggressive mischief in a lab – [A Research Integrity commentary](#)
10. You have been screened – [A Human Research Ethics commentary](#)

Please join us in saying a big thank you to our Institutional Patrons:

- Bendigo Health
- CanTeen
- Central Queensland University
- Children's Health Queensland Ethics
- Grampians Health - Ballarat
- James Cook University
- Marcus Oldham College
- Queensland University of Technology
- RAND Australia
- Torrens University
- University of Canterbury (NZ)
- University of Melbourne
- University of Technology Sydney

By their generosity, they keep Research Ethics Monthly free and ad-free

Things You May Have Missed...

Our Newsroom

01. [Pressure to publish is 'fueling illegal practices in palaeontology'](#) - Nature
02. [\(Norway\) Norway jails researcher who let Iranians use microscope](#) - Times Higher Education
03. [Has COPE membership become a way for unprincipled journals to buy a fake badge of integrity?](#) - Dr Peter Wilmshurst Blog
04. [Radical transparency can fix bad behaviour by academic journals](#) - The Higher Education
05. [Protect researchers from online abuse, universities told](#) - The Higher Education
06. [STEM Graduate Programs Should Embrace Failure](#) - Undark
07. [\(China\) 'Junk science': Counterfeit research papers in China, a worrying trend](#) - The BL
08. [Could AI help you to write your next paper?](#) - Nature
09. [Living Science: Authorship then and now](#) - Elife
10. [Bad Brains](#) - Return

There were more than 100 more great items added in the last 90 days. Follow us on social media to get an alert when new items are added ([LinkedIn](#) | [Facebook](#))

Our Resource Library

01. [How often do cancer researchers make their data and code available and what factors are associated with sharing?](#) - Papers
02. [Analysis of predatory emails in early career academia and attempts at prevention](#) - Papers
03. [\(Middle East\) Awareness and knowledge of manuscript writing and research integrity: A cross-sectional survey among graduate students](#) - Papers
04. [The critical role of ethics in forced migration research: Refugee participation, Do No Harm, and the IASFM Code of Ethics](#) - Talks
05. [\(Canada\) Evaluating prospective study registration and result reporting of trials conducted in Canada from 2009-2019](#) - Preprint Paper
06. [Can transparency undermine peer review? A simulation model of scientist behavior under open peer review](#) - Papers
07. [Decontamination of the scientific literature](#) - Preprint
08. [\(Poland\) Hotspots of academic misconduct and misrepresentations among academics in the Republic of Poland, a European Union member state](#) - Preprint
09. [Why medicine often has dangerous side effects for women](#) - Talks
10. [\(Netherlands\) How \(not\) to be held accountable in research: The case of the Dutch integrity code](#) - Papers



Do you know someone who hasn't subscribed yet to the Research Ethics Monthly? Please encourage them to [subscribe](#) now and help us grow this community.



Got an idea for a post or a suggestion for a guest? Send an email to gary.allen@ahrecs.com



Do you have a view, feedback or some constructive criticism on this or other posts? Every item has a comment link so you can have your say and continue the conversation.



Copyright © 2022 Australian Human Research Ethics Consultancy Services (AHRECS). All rights reserved.

We hate spam and definitely don't want to bother you with unwanted emails. You can update your preferences or unsubscribe from this list.

This newsletter is authorized by the AHRECS team, [click here](#) for contact and other details.

We would never divulge your details to anyone else, including not disclosing you're a subscriber, without your permission.

