DEUTSCHE INSTITUTE FÜR
TEXTIL+FASERFORSCHUNG

STATUTES TO ENSURE GOOD SCIENTIFIC PRACTICE

approved by the Board of Trustees (Kuratorium) of the
Deutsche Institute für Textil- und Faserforschung Denkendorf (German Institutes of Textile and Fiber Research Denkendorf)
at its meeting on April 30, 2002, last amended by written resolution dated December 5, 2024.

## Table of contents:


**Preliminary Remark ..... 2**
**1. General principles of scientific work ..... 3**
***a) Rules for everyday scientific practice and quality assurance ..... 3***
***b) Rules of collegiality and cooperation ..... 5***
***c) Rules for the publication of results ..... 6***
***d) Rules for performance evaluation ..... 6***
**2. Teamwork and leadership responsibility in working groups ..... 7**
**3. Supervision of junior scientists ..... 7**
**4. Backup and storage of primary data ..... 8**
**5. Scientific publications ..... 9**
**6. Appointment of the ombudsperson ..... 9**
**7. General principles for dealing with suspected cases of scientific misconduct ..... 10**
**8. Facts of scientific misconduct ..... 11**
**9. Investigations ..... 13**
**10. Conclusion of the proceedings in the event of substantiated suspicion ..... 15**
**11. Possible sanctions and measures ..... 15**


*Note: In order to ensure that those persons working in our institution who are only partially familiar with the German language can also take full note of the content of the rules of good scientific work, the statutes have also been published in this English version. Nevertheless, the German version remains legally binding.*

## Preliminary Remark

Scientific honesty and compliance with the principles of good scientific practice are indispensable prerequisites for all scientific work that aims to gain knowledge and should be respected by the public. Violations of the principles of good scientific practice are possible in a variety of ways, from a lack of care in the application of scientific methods or in the documentation of data to serious scientific misconduct through deliberate falsification and fraud. In any case, such violations are incompatible with the nature of science itself as a methodical and systematic research process aimed at gaining verifiable knowledge. Furthermore, they destroy the public's trust in the reliability of scientific results as well as the trust between scientists, which is an important prerequisite for scientific work in the division of labor that defines science today.

Even if dishonesty in science cannot be completely prevented by regulations, appropriate precautions can ensure that all those involved in the research process are regularly made aware of the standards of good scientific practice. This makes a significant contribution to limiting scientific misconduct.

The basic rules of good scientific practice listed here take up the proposals of the German Research Foundation of January 1998 in its current form and adapt them to the research conditions of the German Institutes of Textile and Fiber Research Denkendorf. The last update was bindingly adopted by the Board of Trustees of the German Institutes of Textile and Fiber Research Denkendorf on 23.06.2020 in the form of a statute.

## 1. General principles of scientific work

The German Institutes of Textile and Fiber Research Denkendorf (DITF) undertake to inform all scientific staff about the applicable regulations on good scientific practice by posting them on the intranet. The following regulations in particular are to be observed as general principles of scientific work at the DITF:

*a) Rules for everyday scientific practice and quality assurance*

- Strict adherence to discipline-specific rules for the collection and selection of data.

- Reliable backup and storage of primary data; clear and comprehensible documentation of all important results, including those that do not support the research hypothesis. Misconceptions should be communicated without fear of negative consequences. If available, professional recommendations for review and evaluation are applied. Any deviation from the professional recommendations must be justified. Documentation and research results must not be manipulated and must be protected against attempts at manipulation. When developing research software, the source code is documented as far as this is possible and reasonable. Individual results that do not support the hypothesis are also documented as a matter of principle. A selection of results does not take place. Manipulation of the documentation and research results is not permitted.

- The person who collects the research data is entitled to use it; access by third parties is restricted if the data is subject to confidentiality. Agreements on rights of use to research data and results are documented at the earliest possible point in time. This applies in particular if a scientist is about to change and self-generated data is to continue to be used for their own research purposes.

- Rule of systematic skepticism: Openness to doubts, even about your own results or the results of your own group.

- Awareness of tacit axiomatic assumptions; control of wishful thinking motivated by self-interest or morality; systematic attention to possible misinterpretations as a result of the methodically limited comprehensibility of the object of research (over-generalization).

- Answering research questions using scientifically sound and reproducible methods. If new methods are developed, this is done with particular attention to quality assurance and the establishment of standards.

- Compliance with legal requirements, but also with obligations entered into with third parties, in particular confidentiality obligations. Where necessary, approvals and ethics votes are obtained and submitted. Research projects are carried out taking into account the consequences of the research and assessing the individual ethical aspects.

- Consideration of gender equality and diversity as well as the avoidance of unconscious bias in relation to personnel selection and development.

- Continuous training and updating of knowledge on the standards of good scientific practice and the current state of research.

- The origin of data, organisms and materials used in the research process is identified and the subsequent use is documented. The original sources are cited.

- Scientists carry out every step in the research process lege artis. When scientific findings are made publicly accessible (in the narrower sense in the form of publications, but also in the broader sense via other communication channels), the quality assurance mechanisms applied are always set out. This applies in particular when new methods are developed. Inappropriately small publications should be avoided and self-citations should be kept to a minimum.

- The type and scope of research data generated in the research process are described.

- When scientific findings are made publicly available (also via channels other than publications), the quality assurance mechanisms applied are always explained. If discrepancies or errors in such findings are subsequently discovered or pointed out, these are corrected.

- The roles and responsibilities of the scientists involved in a research project must be defined in an appropriate manner and be clear at all times. If necessary, the roles and responsibilities will be adjusted.

- When planning a project, scientists take the current state of research fully into account and recognize it. As a rule, this requires careful research into publicly accessible research work. Research can be carried out via the internal library; the DITF provide the necessary resources. Appropriate methods are used to avoid (even unconscious) bias in the interpretation of findings, insofar as this is possible and reasonable. In particular, it should be examined whether and to what extent gender and diversity can be significant for the research project.

If reviewers or committee members gain access to external content, confidentiality continues to apply; this excludes disclosure to third parties and personal use.

*b) Rules of collegiality and cooperation*

- No obstruction of the scientific work of competitors, for example by delaying reviews or by passing on scientific results obtained in confidence.
- Promoting the scientific qualification of young researchers.
- Openness to criticism and doubts from colleagues and employees.
- In particular, treat manuscripts and applications for funding as well as the assessment of the expulsion of persons as strictly confidential.
- Careful, disinterested and unbiased peer review.
- Waiver in the event of bias and disclosure of facts justifying bias. This obligation also applies to members of scientific advisory and decision-making bodies.

In principle, scientists contribute all their results to the scientific discourse. In individual cases, there may be reasons for not making results publicly accessible. In principle, the decision to make results publicly accessible must not depend on third parties; rather, scientists decide on their own responsibility and taking into account the practices of the respective subject area whether, how and where they make their results publicly accessible. Exceptions are permitted in particular where the rights of third parties are affected, patent applications are in prospect, contract research or security-related research is involved. If results are made publicly accessible, they must be fully and comprehensibly described. This also includes making the research data, materials and information on which the results are based, the methods used and the software employed available, insofar as this is possible and reasonable. This is done according to the so-called FAIR principles: Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Re-Usable. Exceptions are permitted in the context of patent applications. Self-programmed software is made available with the source code, insofar as this is possible and reasonable. If necessary, a license is granted. Workflows are comprehensively described. Own and third-party preliminary work must be fully and correctly documented, unless this can be waived in exceptional cases in the case of own results that are already publicly accessible. At the same time, the repetition of the contents of own publications is limited to the extent necessary for understanding.

An author is someone who has made a genuine, comprehensible contribution to the content of a scientific text, data or software publication. Whether a genuine and

comprehensible contribution exists depends on the subject-specific principles of scientific work and must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. If a contribution is not sufficient to establish authorship, the support can be appropriately acknowledged in footnotes, in the foreword or in acknowledgements. Honorary authorship where no sufficient contribution has been made is just as inadmissible as inferring authorship solely on the basis of a managerial or supervisor function. All authors must agree to the final version of the work to be published; they bear joint responsibility for the publication, unless expressly stated otherwise. Approval for publication may not be refused without sufficient reason. Rather, the refusal must be justified with verifiable criticism of data, methods or results. Researchers agree in good time - usually at the latest when formulating the manuscript - who is to be the author of the research results. The agreement must be based on comprehensible criteria and take into account the conventions of each subject area.

The scientific quality of a contribution does not depend on the publication medium in which it is made publicly accessible. In addition to publications in books and specialist journals, specialist, data and software repositories as well as blogs also come into consideration. Authors choose the publication medium carefully, taking into account its quality and visibility in the respective field of discourse. A new publication medium is checked for its reliability. Anyone who takes on an editorship carefully checks for which publication organ this is done.

*c) Rules for the publication of results*

- Publication of results in principle obtained with public funds (principle of public access to basic research).

- Publishing even falsified hypotheses in an appropriate manner and admitting errors (principle of a scientific culture open to error).

- Strict honesty in the recognition and appropriate consideration of the contributions of predecessors, competitors and employees (principle of recognition).

- Publications are, as far as possible and reasonable, based on the scientists' own decision and on their own responsibility, with reference to the underlying information.

*d) Rules for performance evaluation*

- Originality and quality take precedence over quantity as performance and assessment criteria for examinations, the awarding of academic degrees, promotions, recruitment and appointments. When assessing performance, quantitative factors are only included in the overall assessment in a differentiated and reflected manner. Qualitative standards should be in the foreground. This should

also apply primarily to the performance and workload-oriented allocation of resources in research. In addition to the provisions of the AGG, voluntary information on individual characteristics in CVs will be taken into account in the evaluation process.

## 2. Teamwork and leadership responsibility in working groups

The management of the DITF is responsible for an appropriate institutional organizational structure that ensures that all legal and ethical standards can be met. The management of the institution is structurally responsible for communicating the principles of good scientific practice. There are clear and written procedures and principles for the selection of personnel that are consistently applied.

The head of each scientific research unit is responsible for the entire unit. The cooperation in scientific research units must be such that the group as a whole can fulfill its tasks, that the necessary cooperation and coordination take place and that all members are aware of their roles, rights and duties. The management task also includes, in particular, ensuring the appropriate individual supervision of junior researchers - embedded in the overall concept of the respective research institution - as well as the career advancement of academic and academic support staff. Abuse of power and the exploitation of dependency relationships must be prevented by suitable organizational measures both at the level of the individual academic unit and at the level of the management of academic institutions. In larger groups, a regulated form of organization is recommended, e.g. through regular colloquia. The mutual review of work results must be ensured, also by making one's own results accessible. The primary test of a scientific result is its reproducibility. The more surprising, but also the more desirable a result is, the more important it is - as far as possible with reasonable effort - to independently repeat the path to the result within the research group before passing it on to the outside world.

Leadership functions in working groups can only be performed responsibly with knowledge of all relevant circumstances; the leadership of a working group is responsible for it and therefore requires expertise, presence and an overview. The respective members of the working group must be aware of their roles, rights and duties. Where this is no longer sufficiently the case due to the size of the group or other circumstances, management tasks must be delegated in such a way that the respective management span remains manageable.

## 3. Supervision of junior scientists

Particular attention must be paid to the training and promotion of young academics and their guidance in observing the principles of good scientific practice. In order to ensure that good scientific work and scientific training are taught as early as possible, the

particular importance of good cooperation with the universities is expressly pointed out.

In the scientific research units of the DITF, care must be taken to ensure that junior scientists, in particular diploma and doctoral students as well as younger postdocs and habilitation candidates, are adequately supervised and that there is a primary contact person. For the supervision of doctoral students, it is advisable to provide supervision by one or two other experienced academics in addition to the primary contact person. Appropriate involvement of the university at which the doctorate is being completed must be ensured (doctoral supervision group/thesis committee).

## 4. Backup and storage of primary data

Primary data as the basis for publications must be stored on durable and secure media in the scientific research units where they were generated for at least ten years, insofar as this is possible. Access to the data must be guaranteed for authorized interested parties. The DITF ensure that the necessary infrastructure for archiving is available.

Scientific investigations, experiments and numerical calculations can only be reproduced or reconstructed if all important steps are traceable. It is therefore necessary to keep sufficiently complete records and retain them for at least ten years, if only to be able to refer back to the records if published results are disputed by others.

The further details and responsibilities - in particular the requirements for proper logging and the access rules for the use of data - are to be regulated by the management of the DITF and laid down in writing.

Researchers shall store research data or results that are made publicly accessible, as well as the central materials on which they are based, in an adequately accessible and traceable manner at the institution where they were created or in cross-site repositories. Storage takes place on the DITF servers in the drives and directories intended for the scientific research unit, which in turn are archived. Secure access is ensured by assigning rights and roles at person level. The standards of the relevant subject area are decisive. As a rule, the research data to be archived is saved as raw data.

They are stored for an appropriate period of at least 10 years. In this respect, too, the standards of the subject area concerned are decisive. The retention period begins with the establishment of public access to the respective data or results. Archiving also applies to the research software used.

If there are comprehensible reasons for not retaining certain data or only retaining it for a shorter period of time, the researchers shall explain these reasons in a comprehensible manner.

## 5. Scientific publications

Publications are the most important medium for communicating research results to the scientific and general public. In doing so, authors announce results for whose scientific reliability they assume responsibility. Publications reporting on new scientific results must therefore describe the results and the methods used in a complete and comprehensible manner and provide complete and correct evidence of their own and others' preliminary work; previously published results should only be repeated to the extent that this appears necessary for an understanding of the context. Findings that support the results presented or call them into question should also be communicated. The publication medium is chosen carefully, taking into account quality and visibility in the respective field of discourse.

If several authors are involved in a research paper or the publication based on it, only those who have made a significant contribution to the conception of the studies or experiments, to the preparation, analysis and interpretation of the data and to the formulation of the manuscript itself and have agreed to its publication may be named as co-authors. Unless expressly stated otherwise, the authors are always jointly responsible for the content; so-called “honorary authorship” is not permitted. Support from third parties must be acknowledged in an acknowledgement.

## 6. Appointment of the ombudsperson

A neutral, qualified ombudsperson with personal integrity must be elected by the scientific staff at the DITF to advise in cases of conflict in matters of good scientific practice. The ombudsperson should have a deputy in the event of concerns of bias or incapacity. In particular, the ombudsperson has the task of being available as a confidential and advisory contact person for whistleblowers and other parties involved in the event of suspected violations of the principles of good scientific practice.

The whistleblower and the person affected by the allegations must not suffer any disadvantages for their own academic or professional advancement solely because of the whistleblowing.

The core tasks of the ombudsperson include advising on issues of good scientific practice and solution-oriented conflict mediation.

The name and contact details of the ombudsperson will be published on the intranet. The ombudsperson should not be a member of the management of the DITF or the Investigation Committee at the same time and should have management experience.

Enquirers have the option of contacting the local ombudsperson or the national ‘Ombuds Committee for Research Integrity in Germany’.

The ombudsperson can contact the management of the DITF to be relieved of their ombudsperson duties, so that they can be relieved by administrative support or a reduction in other tasks.

The DITF ombudsperson shall report to the Chairman of the Board of Trustees on their work once a year in anonymized form. They are appointed for a period of 4 years, whereby a maximum of one further term of office is possible. Further details on the election and function of ombudspersons are regulated in these statutes and by service agreement. The regulations adopted by the Board of Trustees regarding the initiation of an investigation procedure in the event of suspected academic misconduct remain unaffected.

## 7. General principles for dealing with suspected cases of scientific misconduct

All scientific research units of the DITF that investigate suspected scientific misconduct within the scope of their responsibility are committed to protecting both the whistleblower and the person(s) affected by the allegations (accused) in an appropriate manner. The competent bodies are aware that the conduct of proceedings and the final, possible imposition of sanctions can constitute a considerable encroachment on the legal interests of the accused. The investigation of allegations of scientific misconduct must be conducted at all times in accordance with the principles of the rule of law, fairly and with the presumption of innocence. The investigation must also be confidential. Investigations are conducted without regard to the person, decisions are made without regard to the person.

The report by whistleblowers must be made in good faith. Whistleblowers must have objective evidence that standards of good scientific practice may have been violated. If the whistleblower is unable to verify the facts on which the suspicion is based or if there are uncertainties regarding the interpretation of the statutes on good scientific practice with regard to an observed process, the whistleblower should contact the Ombudsperson to clarify the suspicion. However, the whistleblower is under no obligation to investigate the facts of the case. It is sufficient for the whistleblower to provide concrete evidence of misconduct; the investigation is then the responsibility of the office responsible at the DITF.

Alternatively, the DITF have also set up a whistleblower office where information can also be submitted. The whistleblowing office can be viewed at the following link:

https://www.ditf.de/en/index/ditf/compliance-at-the-ditf/whistleblower-system.html.

Neither the whistleblower nor the accused/affected person should suffer any disadvantages for their own academic or professional advancement because of the whistleblowing. This applies to the accused person until misconduct has been proven and established. In the case of persons in early career phases, the accusation should not

lead to delays during their qualification. The preparation of theses and doctorates should not be put at a disadvantage. The same applies to working conditions and possible contract extensions.

The whistleblower must also be protected if misconduct is not proven in the proceedings. This only applies if the allegation was made against better knowledge.

All bodies involved in the procedure are committed to carrying out the entire procedure as quickly as possible. They shall take the necessary steps to complete each stage of the procedure within a reasonable period of time.

A suspicious activity report in which the reporting person does not disclose their identity (anonymous report) will be reviewed if the reporting person provides reliable and sufficiently concrete facts that allow for a review with reasonable effort.

If the identity of the whistleblower is known to the competent body, the body shall treat the identity confidentially and shall not disclose it to third parties without the consent of the whistleblower. Consent should be given in text form. Information may also be disclosed without consent if there is a legal obligation to do so. Disclosure may also be made in exceptional cases if the accused person would otherwise not be able to defend themselves properly because the identity of the person providing the information is important for this. Before the identity of the informant is disclosed, the informant is informed of the intended disclosure. They can then decide whether to withdraw the suspicious activity report. If the report is withdrawn, it will not be disclosed unless there is a legal obligation to disclose it. The investigation procedure may nevertheless be continued if a weighing of interests shows that this is necessary in the interest of scientific integrity in Germany or in the legitimate interest of the DITF.

The confidentiality of the procedure is restricted if the whistleblower makes their suspicions public. The body responsible for the investigation decides on a case-by-case basis at its own discretion how to deal with a breach of confidentiality by the whistleblower.

The principle of confidentiality applies until scientific misconduct is proven at all stages of the procedure with regard to all parties involved and all findings.

## 8. Facts of scientific misconduct

Scientific misconduct occurs when a person working in research at the DITF intentionally or through gross negligence makes false statements in a scientifically relevant context, appropriates the scientific achievements of others without authorization or impairs the research activities of others.

False statements are in particular

a) the invention of scientifically relevant data or research results,

b) the falsification of scientifically relevant data or research results, in particular by suppressing or eliminating data or results obtained in the research process without disclosing this, or by falsifying a representation or illustration,
c) the incongruent presentation of image and corresponding statement,
d) incorrect science-related information in a funding application or as part of the reporting obligation,
e) claiming the authorship or co-authorship of another person without their consent.

The following cases in particular constitute unauthorized misappropriation of third-party scientific work:

a) unmarked adoption of third-party content without the required source citation ("plagiarism"),
b) unauthorized use of research approaches, research results and scientific ideas ("theft of ideas"),
c) unauthorized disclosure of scientific data, theories and findings to third parties,
d) presumption or unfounded assumption of authorship or co-authorship of a scientific publication, in particular if no genuine, comprehensible contribution was made to the scientific content of the publication,
e) falsification of the scientific content,
f) unauthorized publication and unauthorized making available to third parties as long as the scientific work, finding, hypothesis, doctrine or research approach has not yet been published.

The research activities of others are impaired in the following cases in particular:

a) sabotage of research activities (including damaging, destroying or tampering with experimental set-ups, equipment, documents, hardware, software, chemicals or other items required by others for research purposes),
b) falsification or unauthorized removal of research data or research documents,
c) falsification or unauthorized removal of the documentation of research data.

Scientific misconduct on the part of researchers working at the DITF also arises - in the case of intent or gross negligence - from:

a) co-authorship of a publication that contains false information or inadmissibly appropriated third-party scientific work,
b) neglect of supervisory duties if another person has objectively fulfilled the facts of scientific misconduct and this would have been prevented or made considerably more difficult by the necessary and reasonable supervision.

Scientific misconduct also arises from the intentional participation (in the sense of instigation or aiding and abetting) in the intentional misconduct of others, as defined in these statutes.

Scientific misconduct on the part of reviewers or committee members is deemed to have occurred if they intentionally or grossly negligently:

a) make unauthorized use for their own scientific purposes of scientific data, theories or findings of which they have gained knowledge in the course of their work as an expert or committee member,
b) disclose data, theories or findings to third parties without authorization in breach of the confidentiality of the procedure in the course of their activities as an expert or committee member,
c) do not disclose facts or circumstances that could give rise to concerns of bias to the competent body in the course of their work as an expert or committee member.

Scientific misconduct shall also be deemed to have occurred if a person providing an expert opinion or a member of a DITF committee fails to disclose facts in the course of his/her activities with the intention of gaining an advantage for him/herself or another person, contrary to his/her better knowledge, which reveal scientific misconduct on the part of the other person within the meaning of paragraphs 1 to 5.

## 9. Investigations

In principle, whistleblowers should contact the ombudsperson with a report of suspected misconduct. A report of suspected misconduct should always be made in text form. It can be made verbally; in this case, a transcript must be prepared by the receiving office. If whistleblowers contact the whistleblower office directly with their report, the member will forward the report to the ombudsperson as the responsible party.

In the event of concerns about bias on the part of the ombudsperson or the whistleblower body, the other body that is not biased can be called upon.

Both the whistleblower office and the ombudsperson examine confidentially whether there is a sufficiently concrete suspicion of misconduct.

The ombudsperson will first carry out a preliminary review.

As part of the preliminary examination, the ombudsperson may conduct the investigations necessary to clarify the facts of the case, insofar as these are permitted by higher-ranking law. For example, it may request, obtain and inspect documents, obtain and secure other evidence, obtain opinions or - if necessary - obtain external expertise. All persons involved must be requested to treat the request confidentially.

If the suspicion is confirmed, the suspected case is forwarded to a commission of inquiry, which conducts formal proceedings.

The investigative commission has 4 members. The investigative commission elects the chairperson from among its members. Two university lecturers who do not work at the DITF and two scientific employees of the DITF are members of the investigative commission. The ombudsperson and the compliance officer are members of the

commission as permanent guests in an advisory capacity. At least two members of the investigative commission are full professors at a university.

The voting members of the commission are appointed by the Board of Directors for the duration of the investigation.

A new member shall be appointed in the event of concerns of bias or if a member of the commission is unable to attend for more than a short period of time. Sections 22 et seq. of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Strafprozessordnung) shall apply accordingly to concerns of bias. Concerns of bias can be raised by all voting members of the commission, by the DITF ombudsperson or by the accused. The commission shall make a decision excluding the person against whom the claim of bias is directed. Procedural acts that cannot be postponed may still be carried out.

All voting members of the commission have equal voting rights; the chairperson also has the right to vote. Resolutions are passed by a simple majority; in the event of a tie, the chairperson has the casting vote. The committee is only quorate if at least 3 persons are present and can vote validly.

The members of the commission carry out their activities independently, in particular independently of instructions or informal case-related influences by the DITF. Their work is confidential, i.e. confidentiality is maintained, and the meetings are not open to the public.

The investigative commission will schedule a meeting as soon as possible. For the meeting, the accused person is given the opportunity in good time beforehand to make an oral statement to the commission (hearing) or in writing regarding the allegation. The informant is also given another opportunity to comment. In addition, the accused person and the whistleblower must be given the opportunity to comment at every stage of the proceedings. If the accused person refrains from making a further statement, this alone may not be taken into account to their disadvantage. A decision must then be made on the basis of the case file.

The investigative commission may hear other persons orally whose opinions it deems useful for the proceedings at its own discretion. With regard to possible rights to refuse to give evidence, the provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Strafprozessordnung) shall apply accordingly.

Any person who is heard by the investigative commission may call in a person they trust to assist them. The investigative commission must be informed in good time.

The investigative commission shall examine whether scientific misconduct has been proven to its satisfaction in accordance with the traditional rules of free evaluation of evidence. Scientific misconduct can only be established if a majority decision has been

made on this within the investigative commission. The deliberations are subject to confidentiality.

Section 7 applies accordingly to confidentiality and the disclosure of the identity of the person providing the information.

## 10. Conclusion of the proceedings in the event of substantiated suspicion

Once the investigative commission has completed its investigation, it will submit a recommendation with a proposal for further measures and sanctions, including with regard to safeguarding the rights of others, to the Executive Board for a decision and further action as to whether scientific misconduct has been established against the accused person and whether and which sanctions and measures will be imposed on him/her. The outcome of the proceedings may be communicated to the scientific organizations concerned and, where appropriate, to third parties with a justified interest in the decision.

The decision will be communicated to the whistleblower together with a statement of reasons.

## 11. Possible sanctions and measures

The following sanctions and measures may be considered:

a) Requesting the accused person to retract or correct incriminated publications or to refrain from publishing incriminated manuscripts.
b) Exclusion from an appraisal activity.
c) Labor law warning, ordinary termination, contract termination, extraordinary termination.
d) Report the offense to the police or public prosecutor's office.
e) Notification of an administrative offense to the competent authority.
f) Assertion of claims under civil law, in particular for damages, restitution or removal/omission.

Offenses can also be prosecuted and sanctioned accordingly if the accused person is no longer working at the DITF, but was scientifically active at the DITF at the time of the offense.

These rules for safeguarding good scientific practice are binding and were adopted by the DITF Board of Trustees in the form of a statute. They form a sufficient legal basis for the conduct of proceedings for scientific misconduct.

Denkendorf, 05.12.2024

For the Executive Board

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Prof. Dr. Götz T. Gresser | Prof. Dr. Michael R. Buchmeiser | Peter Steiger |