



**CODE OF
ETHICS AND GOOD PRACTICES
IN RESEARCH AND SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS
AT POZNAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY**

Poznan 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREAMBLE	3
CHAPTER I. GOOD AND BAD PRACTICES IN CONDUCTING SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.....	4
Section 1. Good practices in research planning	4
Section 2. Good practices in conducting research	4
Section 3. Bad practices in research planning	5
Section 4. Bad practices in conducting research	5
CHAPTER II. GOOD AND BAD PRACTICES IN PUBLISHING RESEARCH RESULTS	6
Section 1. Good practices in publication quality	6
Section 2. Good practices in assigning authorship	8
Section 3. Good practices in responsibility for publication	8
Section 4. Good practices in acknowledging non-author contributions to a publication.....	8
Section 5. Bad practices in assigning authorship.....	9
Section 6. Bad practices in omitting authorship	9
Section 7. Bad practices in duplicate or multiple authorship	10
CHAPTER III. DEVELOPMENT OF YOUNG STAFF AND STUDENTS	11
Section 1 Good practices in the treatment of young staff and students	11
Section 2. Bad practices in the treatment of young staff and students.....	11
CHAPTER IV. ENGAGEMENT WITH SOCIETY	12
Section 1. Good practices in engagement with society	12
Section 2. Bad practices in engagement with society	12
CHAPTER V. GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF CONDUCT IN CASES OF BREACHES OF THE CODE OF ETHICS AND GOOD PRACTICES IN RESEARCH AND SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS.....	12

PREAMBLE

Poznan University of Technology is an academic community united by shared values and goals. THE CODE OF ETHICS AND GOOD PRACTICES IN RESEARCH AND SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS has been developed on the basis of universal principles of honesty, reliability, responsibility, respect and fairness — the foundations of scientific work — as indicated in documents that serve as references for ethical standards and good practices in science ^[1,2].

The purpose of this document is to promote, shape and strengthen ethical attitudes among academic staff, as well as to foster trust and integrity within the entire university community. The universal values and principles contained in this Code should form the basis of the everyday actions, mutual relations and decisions of all members of the academic community, thereby contributing to the responsible development of science, education and participation in public life.

CHAPTER I

GOOD AND BAD PRACTICES IN CONDUCTING SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Section 1

Good practices in research planning

§ 1

The subject and scope of scientific research should arise from significant cognitive needs ^[1].

§ 2

The topics and scope of planned scientific research and research projects should always be preceded by a thorough verification of the existence of well-established knowledge in the area concerned.

§ 3

Within the framework of planned research, objectives should be formulated that are achievable and verifiable scientifically (empirically or theoretically), in accordance with research standards and the good practices of the relevant discipline. When applying for funding, the research objectives of the planned studies should be formulated realistically.

§ 4

Empirical research should always be preceded by an analysis of the associated risks and the potential consequences for the researchers themselves, for participants, for third parties, for society, and for the natural environment ^[2].

Section 2

Good practices in conducting research

§ 5

Funds allocated for research should be managed responsibly and efficiently, with accurate and honest accounting for their use ^[1].

§ 6

Research involving human participants must be conducted with respect for human dignity and the voluntary nature of participation ^[2].

§ 7

Scientific research should be carried out in compliance with applicable laws and ethical principles, using recognised methods, and—where new methods are applied—only after their reliability has been properly presented and documented. During research, careful documentation of the work process should be ensured, together with proper management of research data and materials, in a way that allows other researchers to reproduce the experiments and their results ^[1].

§ 8

The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in the research process must be disclosed and documented (including a description of the AI model, the prompts or data used, and the verification procedure). The results obtained must be subject to verification for accuracy.

Section 3 **Bad practices in research planning**

§ 9

Conducting research without a significant cognitive or scientific need, solely for the purpose of academic career advancement, is reprehensible and constitutes a waste of resources, particularly when it involves the expenditure of public funds or causes inconvenience to people, animals, or the environment.

Section 4 **Bad practices in conducting research**

§ 10

Particularly bad practices in conducting research include: dishonest performance of research activities (e.g. experiments or observations), superficial analysis of collected research material, and careless handling or storage of research documentation.

§ 11

Bad research practice includes the biased selection of samples, time periods or geographical areas for statistical research, the biased analysis of data, or the omission of data that are inconvenient for the tested hypothesis.

§ 12

If a research hypothesis is formulated prior to conducting scientific research, it must not be modified afterwards to make it fit the obtained results.

§ 13

It is unacceptable to fabricate scientific data through simulated experiments or observations, or to falsify them by altering the actual numerical values characterising research results ^[1,2].

§ 14

The following constitute unacceptable practices in the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI):

- 1) fabricating data or manipulating data with the intention of confirming a research thesis;
- 2) manipulating images or data through AI in a manner that misleads with respect to the actual results.

CHAPTER II

GOOD AND BAD PRACTICES IN PUBLISHING RESEARCH RESULTS

Section 1

Good practices in publication quality

§ 15

Published works should be characterised by reliability, transparency and accuracy. They should include a description of the research methods sufficient to enable the replication of the study, as well as a reference to an open database of source data, in order to allow other researchers to repeat and verify the published research results (in accordance with the generally accepted scientific principles of intersubjective communicability and intersubjective verifiability)^[2].

§ 16

Research results should be subject to critical evaluation by the authors. The assumptions, conditions and limitations regarding the applicability or interpretation of the results must be discussed thoroughly.

Section 2

Good practices in assigning authorship

§ 17

Honesty, truthfulness, and respect for the intellectual contribution of all individuals involved in the creation of a publication form the basis of proper attribution of authorship. The designation of authorship must correspond to the actual contribution.

§ 18

A researcher is obliged to observe intellectual property rights rigorously^[2].

§ 19

Authorship of a scientific publication must be based solely on a creative and significant contribution to the research. A one-off (technical) contribution to measurements may also be recognised as co-authorship if it led to a cognitively significant result and if it is acknowledged by the other members of the research team as a creative contribution to the preparation of the paper.

§ 20

A person may be considered an author or co-author of a publication only if all three of the following conditions are met ^[2]:

- 1) they have made a significant contribution to such elements of the research work as initiating the scientific idea, developing the concept or design of the study, collecting, analysing and interpreting research data, or preparing, or substantially co-preparing, the first version of the manuscript, or have carried out its critical and constructive substantive review;
- 2) they have approved the final version of the text submitted for publication as an author or co-author;
- 3) their creative contribution has been acknowledged by the other members of the research team.

§ 21

The order in which the names of co-authors appear in a publication should conform to the conventions prevailing in the given scientific discipline and must be agreed upon by all co-authors^[2].

§ 22

Co-authored publications, particularly those intended to serve as the basis for applying for an academic degree or title, should be edited in such a way as to make it possible to assess the precisely defined substantive contribution of each co-author to the publication. Alternatively, the substantive contributions of the co-authors should be explicitly described^[2].

§ 23

AI tools may not be listed as co-authors, as they cannot bear responsibility for, or be held accountable for, the content of a publication. However, they may be acknowledged in the acknowledgements section or mentioned in the description of research methodology. The detailed rules governing the use of AI in scientific research at Poznan University of Technology are defined in Senate Resolution No. 195/2020–2024 of 24 April 2024, on the adoption of the “Principles for the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools at Poznan University of Technology” ^[3].

Section 3

Good practices in responsibility for publication

§ 24

All co-authors share joint responsibility for the integrity of the research and its description in the publication, as well as for compliance with ethical standards in the conduct of research and the attribution of authorship, unless they have expressly agreed otherwise (e.g. that they are responsible only for a specific part of the research within their own specialisation). It is recommended that the nature of each co-author's contribution be clearly stated in the publication^[2].

§ 25

When AI tools are used in the preparation of a publication, responsibility for its content always rests with the authors. Each member of the author team must verify the results produced by AI tools for accuracy, bias, and compliance with copyright law. In cases of doubt, the result should be rejected or corrected. It must be ensured that AI-generated content does not contain plagiarism, false data, or fabricated references. All citations and references must be verified for accuracy and relevance.

Section 4

Good practices in acknowledging non-author contributions to a publication

§ 26

Any non-author contribution to a publication made by an individual or institution should be acknowledged, for example in the form of an acknowledgement including information on the assistance provided. Such information should cover both individuals and institutions, regardless of whether the support was paid or unpaid.

§ 27

Financial support, as well as any other form of assistance, should be appropriately acknowledged.

§ 28

Publications must adhere to the principles of proper citation of other authors' works.

Section 5

Bad practices in assigning authorship

§ 29

Plagiarism — the appropriation of authorship or the misleading presentation of the authorship of all or part of another person's work — is prohibited. It constitutes both one of the most serious breaches of academic good practice and a criminal offence. This means that it is impermissible to copy, reproduce or paraphrase another person's text without citing its source or author, or to sign it with one's own name ^[1,2].

§ 30

It is reprehensible to include as authors persons who are not actual co-authors — that is, individuals who have not made a sufficient intellectual contribution to the work — for any reason, including courtesy or prestige^[1,2].

§ 31

It is bad practice to attribute authorship to a person whose actual contribution is of a distinctly non-creative nature (e.g. providing access to equipment, premises, computing time, or arising from a hierarchical employment relationship) or disproportionately minor (e.g. consultations, advice, bibliographic guidance) ^[1,2].

§ 32

It is bad practice for individuals in managerial positions within a research unit to demand, without intellectual justification, that co-authorship of publications prepared or resulting from the research of their subordinate employees be attributed to them ^[1,2,3].

§ 33

It is unacceptable to present completed publications generated predominantly by AI as one's own scientific works. In particular, AI must not replace a researcher in formulating a research problem, hypotheses, research methodology, or conclusions.

§ 34

It is reprehensible to copy AI-generated content uncritically, especially data, without human verification of its accuracy, adherence to copyright law, or testing for bias.

Section 6

Bad practices in omitting authorship

§ 35

It is bad practice to conceal in one's own publications the use of elements of other works or the results of other researchers, to disregard another person's scholarly achievements, or to mislead readers as to the extent of one's own creative contribution^[1].

§ 36

It is unacceptable to omit co-authors or to fail to include their names in a publication, particularly when such omission would benefit another person, for example in promotion procedures^[1].

§ 37

It is bad practice to conceal one's contribution to a work to which one has made a creative input, as this falsifies the extent of the contribution of the remaining authors.

§ 38

It is unethical to diminish the role of other researchers, students, doctoral candidates or collaborators in the co-authorship of scientific achievements or publications, or to misrepresent their contribution.

Section 7

Bad practices in duplicate or multiple authorship

§ 39

It is bad practice to republish the same work or significant parts thereof without obtaining the consent of all its co-authors and of the editorial board of the journal in which the work was originally published^[1,2].

§ 40

It is reprehensible to inflate one's publication record by repeatedly publishing the same scientific achievement under different titles, or by dividing material that could be presented in a single paper into a number of smaller, separate publications^[2].

§ 41

It is reprehensible to cite one's own or others' works without substantive justification related to the content of the publication, for the purpose of obtaining or increasing the citation count of specific works.

§ 42

It is bad practice to submit the same article to several publishers simultaneously without informing them of this fact and without a declaration that, once the article is accepted for publication, all other submitted versions will be immediately withdrawn from other publishers.

CHAPTER III

DEVELOPMENT OF YOUNG STAFF AND STUDENTS

Section1

Good practices in the treatment of young staff and students

§ 43

Academic staff are obliged to treat young researchers (including academic employees holding the degree of master or doctor) and students with respect and as partners^[2].

§ 44

Academic staff undertaking scientific supervision should possess the subject-matter knowledge necessary for the proper execution of research tasks and the ethical competence to foster interpersonal relations based on respect and consistent with the values and principles of academic ethics.

§ 45

Supervisors should conscientiously fulfil their duties, in particular by ensuring that research conducted under their supervision meets the standards expected of scientific research, and that resulting publications adhere to good practices while avoiding the bad practices listed in this Code.

§ 46

A supervisor overseeing research is obliged to act in accordance with good research practices, guided by their competence and experience, and to avoid conflicts of interest.

§ 47

An academic supervisor overseeing a diploma or doctoral thesis should act in accordance with the principles of ethics in science and ensure that the person under their supervision becomes familiar with the values and ethical principles of conducting scientific research. In particular, the supervisor should inform them of the Code of Ethics and Good Practices in Research and Scientific Publications of Poznan University of Technology and related norms and directives.

Section 2

Bad practices in the treatment of young staff and students

§ 48

It is bad practice for a scientific supervisor to exploit their knowledge, position, or other advantage over a student or doctoral candidate for personal gain ^[2].

§ 49

It is reprehensible for a supervisor to use the very fact of exercising scientific supervision over a diploma or doctoral thesis to claim co-authorship of a scientific work or publications authored by the person under their supervision ^[2].

CHAPTER IV

ENGAGEMENT WITH SOCIETY

Section 1

Good practices in engagement with society

§ 50

It is good practice for the public statements of academic staff always to be based on respect for scientific methods, the exchange of arguments, the analysis of facts and the current state of knowledge, while also demonstrating respect for differing opinions ^[2].

§ 51

As citizens and members of society, academic staff should publicly express their views on matters within their scientific competence, particularly when such matters concern society as a whole.

Section 2

Bad practices in engagement with society

§ 52

It is bad practice to exaggerate the significance of one's own research results or their practical importance^[2].

§ 53

It is bad practice to use the authority of a scholar for promotional or commercial purposes in connection with products or services whose properties are not substantiated by scientific research.

CHAPTER V

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF CONDUCT IN CASES OF BREACHES OF THE CODE OF ETHICS AND GOOD PRACTICES IN RESEARCH AND SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS

§ 54

Institutional responsibility for dealing with identified breaches of the principles of ethics and good practices by academic staff rests with the university. The university is obliged to ensure reliability and adherence to proper procedures in explanatory and disciplinary proceedings^[2].

§ 55

Unethical actions and violations of the Code of Ethics and Good Practices in Research and Scientific Publications should be reported to immediate superiors (heads of departments or directors of institutes) and to faculty deans. It is also possible to report documented cases of breaches of ethical principles and good practices directly to the University Committee for Good Practices and Ethics at Poznan University of Technology. Upon receipt of a report, the Committee will take appropriate action in accordance with its regulations.

§ 56

The university is obliged to provide protection for persons reporting breaches of the principles of ethics and good practices in research and scientific publications, ensuring their confidentiality and protection from any form of retaliation, in accordance with the rules applicable to whistleblowers.

§ 57

Reports of breaches of ethical principles and good practices by academic staff must be made in good faith, must be complete, and may not be anonymous. Malicious or defamatory reports will result in disciplinary sanctions against the reporting person. Retaliation against individuals who report irregularities is also prohibited, and any attempt at retaliation will be treated as a breach of the Code of Ethics and Good Practices of academic staff and may constitute grounds for disciplinary action.

§ 58

All substantiated allegations of misconduct in the conduct of scientific research or the preparation of publications must be thoroughly investigated. If the allegations are confirmed, the facts and circumstances must be carefully examined in order to take appropriate corrective and disciplinary measures in accordance with applicable regulations.

§ 59

The response to breaches of the principles of ethics and good practices by academic staff should be proportionate to the seriousness of the misconduct, take into account whether it was intentional, consider the gravity of its consequences, and reflect both aggravating and mitigating circumstances^[2].

§ 60

Recommended actions in the event of unethical conduct or breaches of good practice include:

- 1) drawing attention to the unethical behaviour or reporting the issue to a superior,
- 2) supervision and elimination of breaches by superiors,
- 3) initiation of disciplinary or other proceedings as provided for by law in the event of legal violations,
- 4) ensuring protection for the whistleblower,
- 5) assessing whether the report of unethical behaviour has been made “in good faith”,
- 6) excluding publications prepared with the use of bad practices from academic achievements considered in competitive, promotion, or evaluation procedures.

The CODE OF ETHICS AND GOOD PRACTICES IN RESEARCH AND SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS AT POZNAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY was developed based on the recommendations of the following sources:

1. Ministry of Science and Higher Education (MNiSW), Reliability in Scientific Research and Respect for Intellectual Property, 2012,
2. Polish Academy of Sciences (PAN), Code of Ethics of the Academic Employee, Annex to Resolution No. 6/2024 of the General Assembly of the Polish Academy of Sciences of 5 December 2024.
3. Resolution No. 195/2020–2024 of 24 April 2024 on the adoption of the “Principles for the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools at Poznan University of Technology”.