Introduction

Versão em Português

Research integrity and responsible conduct of research (RI/RCR) have been high on the policy agenda of the major countries responsible for most activities in science, technology and innovation. Among these countries are the United States, Canada, Australia and several other OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) members, including England, Denmark, France and Germany. Part of this increased attention to the conduct of research, publication and dissemination of results is strongly associated with cases of research misconduct, especially those identified since the 1980s.

This international discussion has gained particular attention at universities, research funding agencies and scientific publishers. In this context, two world conferences have already been organized, the First and Second World Conferences on Research Integrity, held in Lisbon, 2007, and Singapore, 2010. These initiatives have been supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF), The American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), The U.S. Office of Research Integrity, The European Science Foundation (ESF), The European Molecular Biology Organisation (EMBO), The International Council for Science (ICSU) and the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), among others.

Latin America, including Brazil, has had little visibility in this international debate, as the approach to RI/RCR in the region is at its early stages. Comparatively, however, Brazil takes the lead when it comes to initiatives in RI/RCR. The country was the first to organize a national forum on research integrity, the I Brazilian Meeting on Research Integrity, Science and Publication Ethics (BRISPE I), 2010, to address several related topics, with the participation of major speakers who have had an active role in RI/RCR in the global context. In addition, Brazil has recently joined the group of countries who have adopted an official definition of research misconduct, through the recently created Commission for Research Integrity of the Brazilian National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq), http://www.cnpq.br/normas/lei_po_085_11.htm
. In addition, The State of São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) is now responsible for launching the first code of good research practices with emphasis on RI/RCR, http://www.fapesp.br/6566

, in Brazil. However, the country has much work ahead of it, as the international approach to RI/RCR is extremely broad. It includes, for example, educational programs for training young researchers in RI/RCR and policies for universities and funding agencies to address new challenges associated with issues that include "accountability in science" and "data management".

The II Brazilian Meeting on Research Integrity, Science and Publication Ethics (II BRISPE) aims to broaden the participation of the Brazilian academic community in these international conversations and stimulate the interest of researchers, educators and policy makers in dialogues that RI/RCR have established with science & society, accountability in science, public trust in science and research excellence. The II BRISPE, organized by the Medical Biochemistry Institute (IBqM)/UFRJ in collaboration with the Alberto Luiz Coimbra Institute for Graduate Studies and Research in Engineering (COPPE)/UFRJ), is a collaborative effort between UFRJ and
other highly-reputed Brazilian institutions, namely, the Oswaldo Cruz Foundation (FIOCRUZ), Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS), Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Federal University of Santa Maria (UFSM), University of São Paulo (USP), University of Campinas (UNICAMP) and the Inter-American Institute for Global Change Research (IAI). The II BRISPE thus invites young and experienced researchers in the most diverse research areas, to participate in the meetings that will be held during the event at UFRJ, FIOCRUZ, USP and PUCRS, as described in the draft program. The references below provide an overview of the context for the discussions that have been proposed for the II BRISPE:

The dilemma of the honest researcher (EMBO Reports, 12, 745, 2011). http://www.nature.com/embor/journal/v12/n8/full/embor2011134a.html

Report of the Research Integrity Commission (CNPq - Brazilian National Council for Scientific and Technological Development, 2011).
http://www.cnpq.br/normas/lei_po_085_11.htm

Alleged fraud spurs new scientific integrity commission (Science 332: 154-155).
http://www.sciencemag.org/content/332/6026/154.2.full.pdf

Moving toward global science (Science 333: 802, 2011).
http://www.sciencemag.org/content/333/6044/802.summary

Fostering research integrity in Europe (European Science Foundation, 2010). http://www.esf.org

Second World Conference on Research Integrity, 2010. http://www.wcri2010.org/

The Singapore Statement on Research Integrity, 2010. http://www.singaporestatement.org/

Ghostwriting at Elite Academic Medical Centers in the United States (PLoS Medicine, 7, 1-4, 2010). http://www.plosmedicine.org/article/related/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pmed.1000230

Discussing plagiarism in Latin American science (EMBO Reports, 10, 677-682, 2009). http://www.nature.com/embor/journal/v10/n7/full/embor2009134.html

Elsevier to contribute 9 million articles to CrossCheck, 2008. http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/authored_newsitem.cws_home/companynews05_00953

First ESF-ORI World Conference on Research Integrity, 2007. http://www.esf.org/index.php?id=4479

Each co-author should sign to reduce risk of fraud (Nature, 450, 610, 2007). http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v450/n7170/full/450610a.html

Who is accountable? How the responsibilities of co-authors for a scientific paper's integrity could be made more explicit (Nature, 450, 1, 2007). http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v450/n7166/full/450001a.html

Research Ethics: Experts ponder how best to prevent and respond to scientific misconduct as three Japanese cases conclude (Chemical & Engineering News, 85, 76-79, 2007). http://pubs.acs.org/email/cen/html/021207094654.html

Geophysicist faces probe into use of research funds: Co-founder of European Academy of Sciences comes under scrutiny (Nature, 446, 236- 237, 2007). http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v446/n7133/full/446236a.html

Research Integrity: Bubble fusion researcher cleared of misconduct charges, but doubts linger (Science, 351, 921, 2007). http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/summary/315/5814/921

Research misconduct: Federal agencies handle fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism allegations differently, but all take claims seriously (Chemical &Engineering News, 18-22, 2006). http://pubs.acs.org/cen/government/84/8445gov1.html

Misconduct: lack of action provokes web accusations (Nature, 441, 932, 2006). http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v441/n7096/full/441932a.html

Named and shamed: As accusations of scientific misconduct in China become rife, some fear persecution reminiscent of that used in the Cultural Revolution (Nature, 441, 392-393, 2006). http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v441/n7092/full/441392a.html

Scientists behaving badly (Nature, 435, 737-738, 2005). http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v435/n7043/full/435737a.html

Korean cloning scandal: prosecutors allege elaborate deception and missing funds (Science,

312, 980-981, 2005). http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/reprint/312/5776/980.pdf

Misconduct finding at Bell Labs shakes physics community (Nature, 419, 419-421, 2002). http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v419/n6906/full/419419a.html