

Danish Committees on Scientific Dishonesty

Draft ruling for consultation

1 Introduction

On 18 April 2011, Professor James Timmons of the Royal Veterinary College, University of London (hereinafter referred to as the Complainant), submitted a complaint by e-mail to the Secretariat of the Danish Committees on Scientific Dishonesty (DCSD) against you (Defendant 1) and Matthew Laye, Camilla Scheele and Søren Nielsen (defendants 2-4), all of whom work at the Centre of Inflammation and Metabolism (CIM), alleging that all four defendants had acted in a scientifically dishonest manner when drawing up and reporting on research results in four articles.

The Complainant alleges that a series of actions by Defendant 1 in conjunction with an application for funding from the UNIK pool (the UNIK application) for a research project in Defendant 1's laboratory at CIM also fall under the definition of scientific misconduct.

In addition, the Complainant highlights a number of other areas, particularly regarding Defendant 1, in which the Complainant considers aspects of behaviour to have been unacceptable.

Defendants 1-4 submitted a joint response.

The case has been considered by the Danish Committee on Scientific Dishonesty for Research in Health and Medical Science (USF) The USF draft ruling is reproduced below.

Please submit any response you may have to the draft within 15 August 2013.

The draft has also been sent to the Complainant for any additional comments.

[DRAFT RULING – START]

2 Ruling

The Committee finds that Defendant 1 did act in a scientifically dishonest manner when writing an article published in *Diabetologia* (see Note 1). The Committee finds that significant information about the test subjects was omitted from the original methodology section in the article, and that this omission corresponds to 'undisclosed construction of data' as per section 2, 1 of executive order no. 306 of 20 April 2009 and executive order of amendment no. 144 of 20 February 2012 on Danish Committees on Scientific Dishonesty. The Committee also finds that Defendant 1 did act in a grossly negligent manner as it was her responsibility as the lead author to ensure that the information in the methodology section was accurate.

The Committee has informed the Defendant's employers, the University of Copenhagen and Copenhagen University Hospital, by sending a copy of this ruling as per 15 (1) of the DCSD order.