

## CBS Practice Committee - Annual Report 2019

### Introduction

The Practice Committee at CBS was established in late 2016, and hence 2019 was the third full year of the committee's work. There were no cases decided by the Committee in 2019, however one case was referred to the National Committee (Nævnet for Videnskabelig Uredelighed, see below).

The chair of the Committee, Søren Friis Hansen, completed the visits to CBS departments during 2019, presenting the Committee as well as the Danish 2017 Act on Research Misconduct and the Danish Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. All departments at CBS have now been visited. Søren Friis Hansen has participated in the annual conference on Research Misconduct at the University of Copenhagen.

The Practice Committee gave input to the hearing on the new guidelines for publication of CBS employees' external activities.

### Concrete cases

Two complaints were raised before the Practice Committee in 2019.

#### **Complaint regarding plagiarism referred to the National Committee**

In October 2019 the Committee received a complaint from a former student from CBS. The former student had written his master thesis in 2016 in cooperation with another student. The master thesis was not made available to the public. The supervisor of the master thesis was at the time employed as PhD student at CBS.

The former student had discovered that the former Master thesis supervisor had published an article in an international journal, which the student claimed contained a large number of passages and data copied directly from the student's master thesis. The former student claimed that the publication of the article by the former master thesis supervisor should be treated as plagiarism.

An Urkund-report, prepared for the Practice Committee documented that 57 % of the article was comparable to the master thesis.

The article in question was co-authored by the former PhD student's PhD supervisor, who is currently employed at CBS.

The Practice Committee decided to treat the other student, who co-authored the Master thesis, as a party to the proceedings. The Committee also treated the PhD supervisor as a party to the proceedings.

The Committee decided that the complaint concerns plagiarism. Consequently the Committee is obliged to refer the complaint to the National Committee, who shall make a final decision regarding the complaint.

## **Complaint dismissed as manifestly unfounded**

During the spring of 2019 a private person raised a complaint concerning research misconduct against two CBS researchers. The complaint was based on an article in a newspaper, in which a book written by the two researchers had been presented.

According to § 11 (2) of the Act on Research misconduct, a complaint must meet some formal requirements. If these requirements are not met, the Practice Committee cannot consider the substance of the case or forward the complaint to the National Committee.

The complaint must identify the researchers against whom the complaint is raised as well as the scientific product which is the subject of the complaint. The complaint must state the specific allegation research misconduct as well as reasoning for that allegation.

The Committee decided that the complaint did not meet the minimum requirements laid down by the law. The person, who raised the complaint, was informed of the minimum requirements laid down by the law and was given a time limit in order to resubmit the complaint.

As the complaint was not resubmitted, the Committee decided to dismiss the complaint as manifestly unfounded.