Dear colleagues,

In recent years, we can observe an increasing importance of academic and research integrity. Nevertheless, little is known about the experiences and attitudes of scientists related to this issue, especially in countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

Therefore, we would like to explore the extent to which academic and research integrity is important to scientists. This survey is performed as a part of the international Alliance for Life Sciences (A4L) project and scientists employed at the project partner institutions are cordially invited to participate in this study.

We would like to ask you to help us by filling out the online questionnaire. This questionnaire is running on Qualtrics platform and is managed by Masaryk University (Brno, Czechia). Participation in this study is voluntary and your answers are anonymous. Personal data and IP addresses are not collected. The questionnaire is designed to be completed on a computer, please do not use smartphones. Estimated completion time is about 10 minutes.

Basic definitions of terms used in the questionnaire you can find in the Glossary available at the European Network for Academic Integrity (ENAI) webpage: https://www.academicintegrity.eu/wp/glossary/

Thank you very much for your time and considering the participation in our survey.

On behalf of the A4L Focus Group "Research Ethics and Integrity"

Prof. Renata Veselska (Masaryk University, Czechia)
Prof. Eugenijus Gefenas (Vilnius University, Lithuania)

Where did you do your undergraduate studies? (Q1)

- [ ] In the same country where I work now
- [ ] Elsewhere

Where did you do your doctoral studies? (Q2)

- [ ] In the same country where I work now
- [ ] Elsewhere

For how many years have you been a researcher? (Q3)

- ○ 0-5 years
- ○ 6-10 years
- ○ 11-15 years
- ○ >15 years
- ○ I prefer not to answer.

How many doctoral students have you supervised? (Q4)

- ○ None
- ○ 1-5 students
- ○ 6-10 students
- ○ 11 - 15 students
- ○ > 15 students
- ○ I prefer not to answer.

Your gender? (Q5)

- ○ Female
- ○ Male
- ○ Other
- ○ I prefer not to answer.

Do you have a background in a health profession? (Q6)

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ I prefer not to answer.

What kind of research were you doing during your doctoral studies? (Q7)

- [ ] Clinical research
- [ ] Basic research (in the life sciences)

- [ ] Other research

Have you had lectures or courses in science ethics as part of your undergraduate studies? (Q8)

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ I do not remember

Have you had lectures or courses in science ethics as part of your doctoral studies? (Q9)

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ I do not remember

Have you yourself during the last 12 months been the object of pressure to (Q10)

	Yes	No	I'm uncertain
Fabricate data	○	○	○
Falsify data	○	○	○
Plagiarise data	○	○	○
Plagiarise publications (in whole or in part)	○	○	○
Present results in some other misleading way	○	○	○

Have you yourself during the last 12 months ever (Q11)

	Yes	No	I'm uncertain
Fabricated data	○	○	○
Falsified data	○	○	○
Plagiarised data	○	○	○
Plagiarised publications (in whole or in part)	○	○	○
Presented results in some other misleading way	○	○	○

Do you know about anyone in your department who during the last 12 months has (Q12)

	Yes	No	I'm uncertain
Fabricated data	○	○	○
Falsified data	○	○	○

	Yes	No	I'm uncertain
Plagiarised (in any way)	○	○	○
Presented results in some other misleading way	○	○	○

Have you during the last 12 months been exposed to unethical pressure concerning (Q13)

	Yes	No	I'm uncertain
Inclusion or ordering of authors	○	○	○
Design/method	○	○	○
Analysis	○	○	○
Results	○	○	○

Have you during the last 12 months been affected by any consequences of scientific misconduct (Q14)

	Yes	No	I'm uncertain
Ethical	○	○	○
Legal	○	○	○
Methodological	○	○	○
Any other aspect	○	○	○

In your work as a scientist, have you engaged in any of the following behaviors in the last three years? (Q15)

	0 times	Once	Multiple times	Regularly	Allways
Fabricated data?	○	○	○	○	○
To confirm a hypothesis, selectively deleted or changing data after performing data analysis?	○	○	○	○	○
Deleted data before performing data analysis?	○	○	○	○	○
Concealed results that contradicted previous research you published?	○	○	○	○	○
Used phrases or ideas of others without their permission?	○	○	○	○	○
Used/ing phrases or ideas of others without citation?	○	○	○	○	○
Turned a blind eye to colleagues' use of flawed data or questionable interpretation of data?	○	○	○	○	○
Modified the results or conclusions of a study under pressure from an organization that (co-) funded the research?	○	○	○	○	○

	0 times	Once	Multiple times	Regularly	Allways
Not published (part of) the results of a study?	O	O	O	O	O
Deliberately not mentioned an organization that funded your research in the publication of your study?	O	O	O	O	O
Added one or more authors to a report who did not qualify for authorship (honorary author)?	O	O	O	O	O
Selectively modified data after performing data analysis to confirm a hypothesis?	O	O	O	O	O
Reported/ing a downwardly rounded p value (e.g. reporting that a p value of .054 is less than .05)?	O	O	O	O	O
Reported an unexpected finding as having been hypothesized from the start?	O	O	O	O	O
Decided whether to exclude data after looking at the impact of doing so on the results?	O	O	O	O	O
Decided to collect more data after seeing that the results were almost statistically significant?	O	O	O	O	O
Omitted a contributor who deserved authorship from the author's list?	O	O	O	O	O
Stopped collecting data earlier than planned because the result at hand already reached statistical significance without formal stopping rules?	O	O	O	O	O
Deliberately failed to mention important aspects of the study in the paper?	O	O	O	O	O
Not disclosed a relevant financial or intellectual conflict of interest?	O	O	O	O	O
Spread results over more papers than needed to publish more papers (‘salami slicing’)?	O	O	O	O	O
Used confidential reviewer information for own research or publications?	O	O	O	O	O

Please rank the level of your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements according to the suggested ranking. (Q16)

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

It is never appropriate to report experimental data that have been created without actually having conducted the experiment.	○	○	○	○	○
It is never appropriate to alter experimental data to make an experiment look better than it actually was.	○	○	○	○	○
It is never appropriate to try a variety of different methods of analysis until one is found that yields a result that is statistically significant.	○	○	○	○	○
It is never appropriate to take credit for the words or writing of someone else.	○	○	○	○	○
It is never appropriate to take credit for the data generated by someone else.	○	○	○	○	○
It is never appropriate to take credit for the ideas generated by someone else.	○	○	○	○	○
If you are confident of your findings, it is acceptable to selectively omit contradictory results to expedite publication.	○	○	○	○	○
If you are confident of your findings, it is acceptable to falsify or fabricate data to expedite publication.	○	○	○	○	○
It is more important that data reporting be completely truthful in a publication than in a grant application.	○	○	○	○	○
If you witness someone committing research misconduct, you have an ethical obligation to act.	○	○	○	○	○
If you had witnessed a co-worker or peer committing research misconduct, you would be willing to report that misconduct to a responsible official.	○	○	○	○	○
If you had witnessed a supervisor or principal investigator committing research misconduct, you would be willing to report that misconduct to a responsible official.	○	○	○	○	○
If fabricated data are discovered in a published paper, all co-authors must equally share in the blame.	○	○	○	○	○
If fabricated data are discovered in a published paper, all co-authors must get the same punishment.	○	○	○	○	○

Please rank the level of your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements according to the suggested ranking. (Q17)

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Severe scientific misconduct (fabrication, falsification, plagiarism) is common in my area of research	○	○	○	○	○
Less severe scientific misconduct (less than fabrication, falsification, plagiarism) is common in my area of research	○	○	○	○	○
Authorship misconduct (inappropriate authorship) is common in my area of research	○	○	○	○	○
The risk of being detected if you commit severe scientific misconduct in my area of research is high	○	○	○	○	○
The risk of being detected if you commit less severe scientific misconduct in my area of research is high	○	○	○	○	○
The risk of being detected if you commit authorship misconduct in my area of research is high	○	○	○	○	○
The consequences of being detected if you commit severe scientific misconduct in my area of research are severe (loss of scientific career, loss of funding, retraction of publications)	○	○	○	○	○
The consequences of being detected if you commit less severe scientific misconduct in my area of research are severe	○	○	○	○	○
The consequences of being detected if you commit authorship misconduct in my area of research are severe	○	○	○	○	○

Does your department have a written policy about (Q18)

	Yes	No	I'm uncertain
Application for funds	○	○	○
Use of funds	○	○	○
Changes in design/method	○	○	○
Changes in results	○	○	○
Fabrication of data	○	○	○
Falsification of data	○	○	○
Handling of scientific authorship	○	○	○

	Yes	No	I'm uncertain
Plagiarism	○	○	○
Duplicate publication (publishing the same twice)	○	○	○
Harassment	○	○	○

Could you please describe how you contribute to your department's publications? Please tick all that apply below. (Q19)

- ☐ Conceptualization - Ideas; formulation or evolution of overarching research goals and aims
- ☐ Methodology - Development or design of methodology; creation of models
- ☐ Software - Programming, software development; designing computer programs; implementation of the computer code and supporting algorithms; testing of existing code components
- ☐ Validation - Verification, whether as a part of the activity or separate, of the overall replication/ reproducibility of results/experiments and other research outputs
- ☐ Formal analysis - Application of statistical, mathematical, computational, or other formal techniques to analyze or synthesize study data
- ☐ Investigation - Conducting a research and investigation process, specifically performing the experiments, or data/evidence collection
- ☐ Resources - Provision of study materials, reagents, materials, patients, laboratory samples, animals, instrumentation, computing resources, or other analysis tools
- ☐ Data Curation - Management activities to annotate (produce metadata), scrub data and maintain research data (including software code, where it is necessary for interpreting the data itself) for initial use and later reuse
- ☐ Writing - Original Draft - Preparation, creation and/or presentation of the published work, specifically writing the initial draft (including substantive translation)
- ☐ Writing - Review & Editing - Preparation, creation and/or presentation of the published work by those from the original research group, specifically critical review, commentary or revision – including pre-or postpublication stages
- ☐ Visualization - Preparation, creation and/or presentation of the published work, specifically visualization/ data presentation
- ☐ Supervision - Oversight and leadership responsibility for the research activity planning and execution, including mentorship external to the core team
- ☐ Project administration - Management and coordination responsibility for the research activity planning and execution
- ☐ Funding acquisition - Acquisition of the financial support for the project leading to this publication