



PEER REVIEW – problems

Conflicts of interest

Bias

Anonymity & lack of transparency

Lack of training



PEER REVIEW - Solutions

- Universities to set standards & train
- Open reviewing (publications)
- Two stage process (grant applications)
- Recognition as metric for RAE



PEER REVIEW - solvers

- Funders (research grants)
- Universities using editors as resource (publications)
- Institutions to nurture students & employees
- Professional bodies to produce ethical codes
- Consistency assured by sponsors (e.g ORI/FDA)



Independence of researchers & results - problems

- Conflicts of interest & lack of transparency
 - Funders may have different motives
 - Academe's failure to recognise or articulate problems
 - Universities' own COI



Independence of researchers - solutions

- Cultural change required
 - Education re COI
 - Institutions' codes of practice need greater consistency
 - Research required on association between funding and results



Independence of researchers - solvers

- Use of Roberts funding for career and skills development
- Little support for overall regulatory body

Informed consent - problems

- Lack of standardisation
- Inadequate understanding of the expectations of participants (subjects)
- Gap between mechanisms and reality
- Lack of training
- Balancing individual rights with need for research

Informed consent - solutions

- Sharing good practice (but who defines it?)
- Standardisation v inhibition of evolving good practice
- Avoid too many codes of practice
- Foster individuals

Informed consent - solvers

- Institutions individually – not as a group
- No elaborate regulatory hoops
- No regulatory body at all
- Need to capture those outside NHS & Universities

Authorship - problems

- Lack of definition
- Different conventions in different disciplines
- Confusion of use in academic credit ('first author dilemma')

Authorship - solutions

- Unique auditable author ID (like ISDN)
- Contributorship not authorship
- Encouraging guarantorship
- Credit for mentoring

Authorship - solvers

- Local enforcement - but funders & journals should prompt for information
- Research options:
 - Meta-analysis of authorship definitions
 - Convening working groups on authorship – to include funders, academics (from postgrads to heads of dept), editors and bibliometricians

Protection & preservation of data - problems

- Ensuring protection to counter alleged misconduct
- Onus on University
- What about 'failed' biological d
- Value of ddatabase related to legislation and risk

Protection & preservation of data - solutions

- Change in culture and training
- Demonstration of good research practice mandatory for degree confirmation
- Expert gp to define different codes for different disciplines

Protection & preservation of data - solvers

- Universities to provide evidence of training in good practice (as part of RAE)
- Audit can be a sledgehammer to crack a nut
- Code of practice will not stifle innovation
- Not an issue for a central body to solve

Summary

- Many problems recognised
- Cultural shifts required
- Universities & funders responsible for standards/training/policies etc
- Journals can be a resource in providing expertise
- Little appetite for standardisation or central control