

## ***Short communication***

### **We Still Need to Improve Our Research Writing Ethics**

**Sheikh Arslan Sehgal**

Department of Bioscience, COMSATS Institute of Information Technology Sahiwal Pakistan  
State Key Laboratory of Biomembrane and Membrane Biotechnology; Institute of Zoology;  
Chinese Academy of Sciences; Beijing, China

University of Chinese Academy of Sciences; Beijing, China

Email: [arslansehgal@yahoo.com](mailto:arslansehgal@yahoo.com)

**Abstract:** The aim of current effort is too sentient that the people should have to know what is happening and to explore the reasons behind the veil of reasons so they can generate and amend their opinions and deduce their own conclusions. The most worthy asset of a researcher is to publish valuable research and must first be earned the scientific professional integrity and then maintained it. The scientific community must obey the scientific ethical norms and rules if they want to play its due role. Still, we are bearing ethical quandaries in our research and we have to solve them for advancement of research in scientific community including Pakistan.

**Keywords:** plagiarism, ethical issues, authorship issues, data fabrication

**Introduction:** Breaches of publication ethics such as redundant publication, authorship issues, plagiarisms and data fabrication are recognized forms of research misconduct that can undermine the scientific literature <sup>1</sup>.

Still, we are facing the ethical dilemmas in our academic and research work. The research misconducts where data is manipulated for never or fallaciously performed experiment, has been traced from many sides of World <sup>2</sup>. We must change such an environment and teach our students the international, institutional and professional standards regarding research and research methodologies. An overlooked research misconduct; freakishly least or nearly become untraceable; is the authorship issues <sup>3</sup>. Such construing effect of research misconduct with

respect to authorship is a big problem where the credit of real researcher is being haunted by research feudal. A gap has been produced to fill which tangible need to define basic ethics has emerged. To cope such issues, some basic ethics needs to be aware and followed for betterment of research work in scientific community including Pakistan.

**Observed Issues:** Faculty/supervisor should discuss the research work and publication credits with students throughout the research work and publication process. Such understanding between supervisor and student will become a helpful tool for research progress. The authorship should reflect the contribution of the authors <sup>4</sup>. Usually, the faculty members overvalue their contributions to the projects and mostly in authorship situation. Genuinely, both the parties believe that they are right. The supervisor should take the credit only for the work to which they have substantially contributed and they have actually performed. The write-up of the publication or minor contributions to the research should be acknowledged appropriately in appropriate sections <sup>5</sup>. If student substantively contributes to the conceptualization, design, execution, analysis or interpretation of the research reported, they should be listed as authors <sup>6</sup>. Usually, senior lab-members, supervisor's good friends, department chairperson, supervisor's relatives and favorite students share the authorship without any contributions <sup>5</sup>. The same rule applies to the students not to share the authorship with their best friends without contributions. In contrast, as result of supervisor's unnatural feudalistic dictatorialness, students are infusing themselves with the trend to take over supervisor by dismantling his authorship. Such trend produces bad effect in scientific community which in turn aggressively taken by supervisors as offence.

There are many other least observed issues that are genuinely not research misconducts, but disturb research enhancement, like some supervisors even do not start the project of the students at appropriate time.

**Suggestions to scientific community:** The supervisor and student should keep the research theme, idea, results and interpretations confidential. Researchers should have to be honest in all scientific communications. Report the data, results, methods and procedures honestly. Misrepresenting, falsification, and fabrication of data should be discouraged at every stage. It is not ideal to deceive public, science, sponsors, research and colleagues.

Student should always try to be unbiased in write-up, decisions, peer review, data interpretation, data analyses, experimental design and other aspects of research work. Students should always keep their agreements, words and promises and act with sincerity. Avoid careless negligence, errors and erratum.

If necessarily important, be confidential with the findings till it's published but conversely and needfully share the resources, tools, equipment and basic useful data. Students should always show patience for criticism.

Scientific community should always show honor and respect to the intellectual properties including patents and copyrights. Do not cite unpublished results and methods without author permission. Properly mention the credits and acknowledgments to the contributors.

Researchers should publish the data for the advancement of research and science rather than to enhance and/or advance their own career and funds. Also they should avoid publishing duplicative and wasteful data.

Discrimination should always be avoided, discouraged, and bumped off among students and colleagues on the basis of favoritism, ethnicity, race, religion, sex or any other factors that could destroy one's scientific integrity and competence.

If you are the journal manuscript reviewer, then it's your duty to make that idea and work confidential. If you receive the manuscript of your friend, you should have to review it with unbiased decision.

**Conclusion:** Research should be pure from data fabrication and misconducts for the advancement of science. Supervisors and students have to perform their duties, experiments and contributions honestly. Both the parties should not cheat and ditch each other for the betterment of research work.

**Acknowledgements:** Sheikh Arslan Sehgal acknowledges Mirza Ahmad Hammad and Rana Adnan Tahir, Bioinformatics Research Laboratory, Department of Biosciences COMSATS Institute of Information Technology Sahiwal, for their guidance and suggestions.

**References:**

1. Wager, E., Fiack, S., Graf, C., Robinson, A. and Rowlands, I., 2009. Science journal editors' views on publication ethics: results of an international survey. *Journal of medical ethics*, 35(6), pp.348-353.
2. [https://grants.nih.gov/grants/research\\_integrity/research\\_misconduct.htm](https://grants.nih.gov/grants/research_integrity/research_misconduct.htm)
3. Al-Adawi, S., Ali, B.H. and Al-Zakwani, I., 2016. Research Misconduct: The Peril of Publish or Perish. *Oman medical journal*, 31(1), p.5.
4. <https://www.councilscienceeditors.org/resource-library/editorial-policies/white-paper-on-publication-ethics/2-2-authorship-and-authorship-responsibilities/>
5. Shamima P Lasker. Preceding s of Bioethics and Humanity (Pernas 8 JBHKI & ABC17). Indonesia. Nov 2016.
6. <http://www.apa.org/monitor/jan03/principles.aspx>

**Conflict of Interest:** Declared None.

**Author's contribution:** Author developed the idea and wrote the manuscript.