

Doshisha University Policies on Handling Research Misconduct in Research Activities

Established on August 25, 2018

Revised on June 29th, 2019 Revised on December 21st, 2019

Revised on March 25th, 2023

(Purpose)

Article 1 These policies set out necessary particulars concerning the appropriate measures taken at Doshisha University (hereinafter referred to as "University") on the occurrence of research misconduct in research activities (hereinafter referred to as "research misconduct") and the University's lines of responsibility in preventing and handling research misconduct.

(Definitions)

Article 2 1. In these policies, "researcher(s)" refers to faculty, staff, research scholars and students of the University who engage in research activities for the purpose of publication of their research results through academic conferences etc. Those who were faculty, staff, research scholars and students of the University at the point of conducting the research activities concerned are also included.

2. In these policies, "research misconduct" refers to the following acts committed by a researcher either willfully or due to gross neglect of the basic duty of care expected of a researcher.

(1) Misconduct in research listed in each item in paragraph 4, Article 10 of Doshisha University Code of Research Ethics (hereinafter referred to as "specific research misconduct")

(2) Misconduct in research listed in paragraph 6, Article 10 of Doshisha University Code of Research Ethics

(3) Misconduct in research listed in paragraph 2, Article 11 of Doshisha University Code of Research Ethics

(4) Other inappropriate conduct in research activities

3. In these policies, "the complainant" means a person who made an allegation concerning research misconduct (hereinafter referred to as "allegation") to the allegation contact point in writing, fax, e-mail, phone call, in person or in any other means (hereinafter referred to as "in writing, etc.") non-anonymously, disclosing their contact information.

4. In these policies, "the respondent" means a person against whom an allegation was made by the complainant, and "the respondent, etc." indicate the respondent themselves as well as those who are subject to investigation based on the Article 13, section 2 and 3.

(The Responsibilities of Researchers)

Article 3 1. Researchers must take training courses designated by the University on research integrity and laws and regulations related to research activities.

2. In order to secure the means to prove the legitimacy of research activities and ensure the

verifiability by a third party, researchers must preserve and manage experimental and observation notes, experimental data and other research materials for an appropriate period and disclose them when disclosure is deemed necessary and reasonable.

(Lines of Responsibility in Preventing and Handling Research Misconduct)

Article 4 1. The University President shall endeavor to prevent research misconduct, and in case of the occurrence of research misconduct, have the Research Ethics Committee conduct an investigation, and take the final responsibility in those handlings.

2. The Vice President appointed by the University President shall assist the University President as the person in charge of improvement of research integrity and prevention of research misconduct at the University and take appropriate measures to promote ethical research activities.

3. The deans and directors of faculties, graduate schools, research institutes, museums, centers, and the Institute for the Liberal Arts etc. (hereinafter referred to as "faculty or graduate school etc.") must assume the role of an RCR (Responsible Conduct of Research) education officer and periodically provide education on research integrity to researchers and students affiliated with the respective faculties and graduate schools. They shall also promote initiatives concerning preservation and disclosure of research data.

(Allegation Contact Point)

Article 5 1. The allegation contact point shall be set up at the Office of the Ethics Review to ensure prompt and appropriate response to allegations and consultations.

2. The person in charge at the allegation contact point shall be the Director of the Office of the Ethics Review.

(Consultation about Making an Allegation)

Article 6 1. Those who suspect an occurrence of research misconduct but have questions about whether to make an allegation or about the procedures may consult with the allegation contact point in writing, etc.

2. In the case of a consultation where the intention to make an allegation is not explicit, the allegation contact point shall check the case and if there is deemed to be sufficient reason to make an allegation, the contact point shall confirm with the consulter whether the consulter intends to make an allegation or not.

3. In the case of a consultation declaring that someone intends to commit research misconduct or that someone was asked to commit such misconduct, etc., the person in charge at the allegation contact point shall report to the University President and the Chair of the Research Ethics Committee.

4. If the report described in the previous paragraph was made, the University President shall check and discuss the case with the Chair of the Research Ethics Committee, and if there is deemed to be sufficient reason, shall issue a warning to the person concerned in the consultation and to other persons involved as far as necessary.

(Organizational Structure for Receiving Allegations)

Article 7 1. Those who consider that research misconduct has occurred shall be able to make an allegation in writing, etc. to the allegation contact point.

2. As a general rule, an allegation must be made non-anonymously and contain the contact information of the complainant, the name(s) of researcher(s) or research group(s), etc. suspected of research misconduct, the nature of the research misconduct, and other details of the case, as well as a scientifically rational reason for considering it as misconduct.

3. If an allegation is made anonymously, the person in charge at the allegation contact point shall be able to accept it after consulting with the Chair of the Research Ethics Committee about the response.

4. When an allegation is received, the person in charge at the allegation contact point shall promptly report to the University President and the Chair of the Research Ethics Committee. The University President shall then notify the case to the dean of the respondent's affiliated faculty or graduate school, etc.

5. If an allegation is made by any means other than by phone call or in person., the person in charge at the allegation contact point shall notify the complainant that the allegation was received.

(The Obligations of Allegation Contact Point Staff)

Article 8 1. The staff at the allegation contact point must ensure the confidentiality and protection of the complainant.

2. When receiving an allegation, the staff at the allegation contact point must use proper methods, such as holding consultations in a private room in the case of an interview, and taking measures to ensure that the allegation is not heard or seen by other persons in the case of an allegation made in writing, etc.

3. The provisions in the previous two paragraphs shall also apply to cases of consultation about making an allegation.

(Duty of Confidentiality)

Article 9 1. All persons involved in consultations, investigations and other works stipulated in these policies must not leak any confidential information that they have come to know in these processes. This shall also apply to when a person is no longer the faculty or staff of the University.

2. To prevent information from being leaked outside, the University President and the Chair of the Research Ethics Committee must ensure the confidentiality of the complainant, the respondent, etc., details of the allegation, and details and progress of the investigation, up until the investigation results are made public.

3. If an investigated case is leaked outside, the University President shall, after consulting with the Chair of the Research Ethics Committee and, with the consent of the complainant and respondent,

etc., be able to provide a public explanation of the case even if the procedure is ongoing. If the reason of the leak is attributable to the complainant or the respondent, etc., however, the person's consent shall not be needed.

4. When contacting or giving notice to the complainant, the respondent, etc., cooperators in the investigations or other persons involved, the University President, the Chair of the Research Ethics Committee and other persons giving such notice must take care so as not to infringe their human rights, honor and privacy.

(Protection of the Complainant)

Article 10 1. The dean of the faculty or graduate school etc. concerned must take appropriate measures to prevent deterioration of the working environment of or any discriminatory treatment against the complainant on the basis of having made an allegation.

2. All persons affiliated with the University must not disadvantage the complainant for having brought an allegation.

3. The University President shall take appropriate measures if there is a person who has disadvantaged the complainant.

4. Unless an allegation is determined to have been lodged out of malice, the University President must not disadvantage the complainant for having brought an allegation.

(Protection of the Respondent, etc.)

Article 11 1. The University and all persons affiliated with the University must not, without a legitimate reason, disadvantage the respondent, etc. because an allegation was brought.

2. If there is a person who has disadvantaged the respondent, etc. without a legitimate reason, the University President shall take appropriate measures.

(Allegations Lodged out of Malice)

Article 12 1. It is prohibited for any person to make an allegation out of malice. In these policies, "allegation lodged out of malice" refers to an allegation made for the purpose of damaging the respondent, or of hindering research being conducted by the respondent, or otherwise to cause some kind of detriment to the respondent or the organization with which the respondent is affiliated.

2. If an allegation is determined to have been lodged out of malice, the University President shall take appropriate measures.

(Commencement of Preliminary Investigation)

Article 13 The Research Ethics Committee must conduct a preliminary investigation if any of the following cases occurs:

(1) An allegation based on Article 7 was made

(2) An order was issued by the University President

(3) A preliminary investigation is deemed necessary at the Research Ethics Committee for other reasons

(Establishment of Preliminary Investigation Committee)

Article 14 1. For the purpose of conducting a preliminary investigation, the Research Ethics Committee shall establish a Preliminary Investigation Committee under the Research Ethics Committee.

2. The Preliminary Investigation Committee shall consist of three members appointed by the Research Ethics Committee.
3. The Chair of the Preliminary Investigation Committee shall be appointed by the Research Ethics Committee from among the members of the Preliminary Investigation Committee.
4. The Preliminary Investigation Committee must conduct a preliminary investigation promptly. However, the Preliminary Investigation Committee may decide not to conduct a preliminary investigation if it is apparent from the content of the document, etc. that the conduct in question does not fall under research misconduct.
5. The Preliminary Investigation Committee shall, as need arises, be able to request the respondent, etc. to submit related materials and other necessary documents for conducting the preliminary investigation or conduct interviews with the respondent, etc. and other persons involved.
6. The Preliminary Investigation Committee shall be able to take measures to preserve related documents, research notes, and experimental materials etc. that may be used as evidence.

(Method of Preliminary Investigation)

Article 15 1. The Preliminary Investigation Committee shall conduct a preliminary investigation of the likelihood that the reported conduct occurred, the possibility that the said conduct falls under research misconduct, and all the other matters that are necessary upon proceeding with the procedure established by the policies.

2. If a preliminary investigation based on an allegation about research paper(s), etc. involves any research paper(s), etc. withdrawn before the allegation was received, the Preliminary Investigation Committee shall examine the situation, including the background and circumstances of the withdrawal, and determine whether or not the matter should be investigated as an instance of research misconduct.

(Decision on Execution of Formal Investigation)

Article 16 1. The Preliminary Investigation Committee shall report the results of the preliminary investigation to the Research Ethics Committee approximately within 30 days from the day the allegation described in Article 7 was accepted, or from the day the order for preliminary investigation was issued by the University President, or from the day the preliminary investigation was deemed necessary by the Research Ethics Committee.

2. Based on the results of the preliminary investigation, the Research Ethics Committee shall immediately decide whether or not to launch a formal investigation.
3. If the Research Ethics Committee decides to launch a formal investigation, it shall notify this

decision to the complainant and the respondent, etc. and ask for their cooperation in the formal investigation. If the respondent, etc. is affiliated with an organization other than the University, notification shall be made also to that organization.

4. If the thesis which was subject to the preliminary investigation is a thesis created as a part of the graduate school education as well as having never been published, the Research Ethics Committee shall be able to exempt the said thesis from the formal investigation, which shall be reported to the University President.

5. If the Research Ethics Committee decides not to launch a formal investigation, it shall notify the University President and the complainant of the decision with reasons. In this case, materials related to the preliminary investigation shall be preserved so that they may be disclosed when requested by the research funding organization or the complainant. In this case, materials related to the preliminary investigation shall be preserved so that they may be disclosed when requested by organization funding the research expenses related to the case in question, MEXT, and other related government ministries and agencies (hereinafter referred to as "related organizations and agencies"). If the respondent was involved in preliminary investigation, a notification described in this paragraph shall also be sent to the respondent.

6. If the Research Ethic Committee decides to launch a formal investigation, it shall report it to the University President.

7. If the case in question described in the previous paragraph falls under the specific research misconduct, the University President shall report to related organizations and agencies as well as head of a department, graduate school, etc. with which the respondent, etc. is affiliated that a formal investigation will be conducted. If the affiliation of the respondent, etc. differs from that at the time of the corresponding case, the University President shall also notify the head of the department, graduate school, etc. to which the respondent, etc. belonged at the time.

8. If the investigated case described in paragraph 6 falls under any of the actions prescribed in from section 2 to 4 in paragraph 2 of Article 2, the University President, as need arises, file a report or a notification specified in the previous paragraph.

(Establishment of Expert Investigation Committee)

Article 17 If the Research Ethics Committee decides to launch a formal investigation, it shall promptly establish an Expert Investigation Committee and report it to the University President.

(Structure of Expert Investigation Committee members)

Article 18 The Research Ethics Committee shall appoint three or more persons who have no direct conflict of interest with the complainant or the respondent, etc. as members of the Expert Investigation Committee (hereinafter referred to as "Expert Investigation Committee members"). The majority of Expert Investigation Committee Members must be outside experts.

(Notification of Execution of Formal Investigation and Filing of Objection Concerning Expert

Investigation Committee Members)

Article 19 1. After establishing the Expert Investigation Committee, the Research Ethics Committee must notify the complainant and the respondent, etc. of the names and affiliations of Expert Investigation Committee members.

2. Upon receiving the notification described in the previous paragraph, the complainant or the respondent, etc. shall be able to raise an objection to any of the Expert Investigation Committee members in writing to the Research Ethics Committee within 7 days from the day the notification is received.

3. If an objection described in the previous paragraph is raised, the Research Ethics Committee shall examine the details of the objection, and if the objection is deemed to be reasonable, the member concerned shall be replaced, and notification to this effect must be made to the complainant and the respondent, etc. In the case where the detail of objection is deemed not to be reasonable, a notification to that effect must also be made to the complainant who raised objections or the respondent, etc.

4. It shall not be possible to file any further objections against the decision described in the previous paragraph.

(Conduct of Formal Investigation)

Article 20 1. The Expert Investigation Committee shall start the formal investigation approximately within 30 days from the day the Research Ethics Committee decided to conduct the formal investigation.

2. The Expert Investigation Committee shall carry out the formal investigation of the suspected research misconduct in the allegation by close examination of the research paper(s), raw data, experimental and observation notes, and other materials relating to the research in question, as well as interviews and other methods.

3. The Expert Investigation Committee must give the respondent, etc. an opportunity to offer a counterargument in writing or orally.

4. The Expert Investigation Committee may ask the respondent to demonstrate reproducibility by such means as replicating experiments. Replication of experiment shall be conducted under the direction and supervision of the Expert Investigation Committee and the time and use of instruments, etc. within the scope that is deemed to be reasonably necessary shall be ensured.

5. The complainant, the respondent, etc. and other persons involved in the investigated case must cooperate in good faith with the formal investigation, by offering active cooperation for smooth progress of the investigation and faithfully stating the truth, etc.

(Scope of Formal Investigation)

Article 21 The subject of the formal investigation shall be the research activities related to the allegation. The Expert Investigation Committee may decide to include in the formal investigation

other research activities carried out by the respondent if deemed relevant to the formal investigation.

(Preservation of Evidence)

Article 22 1. In conducting the formal investigation, the Expert Investigation Committee shall take measures to preserve materials used as evidence and other related documents regarding the research activities subject to the investigated case.

2. If the research activities subject to the investigated case were conducted at a research institution other than the University, the Expert Investigation Committee shall request that research institution to take measures to preserve materials used as evidence and any other related documents regarding the research activities subject to the investigated case.

3. Except for cases necessary for the measures described in the previous two paragraphs, the Expert Investigation Committee must not restrict the research activities by the respondent, etc.

(Interim Report on the Formal Investigation)

Article 23 1. If an interim report is requested by related organizations and agencies, the Expert Investigation Committee shall submit an interim report to the Research Ethics Committee, even if the procedure is ongoing.

2. The Chair of the Research Ethics Committee shall report to the University President regarding the interim report described in the previous paragraph. The University President shall submit the interim report to relevant funding organization.

(Protection of Research and Technological Information in the Investigation)

Article 24 In conducting the formal investigation, the Expert Investigation Committee shall take all due care not to leak outside any data, research paper(s) or other information covered by the investigation that has not yet been made public and whose confidentiality should be maintained from a technical or research perspective beyond the scope necessary for conducting the investigation.

(Accountability regarding Suspicion of Research Misconduct)

Article 25 1. If during the formal investigation, the respondent, etc. wishes to dispel the suspicion raised concerning the research activity related to the investigated case, the respondent, etc. shall be responsible for presenting and explaining the scientific basis showing that the research was carried out in accordance with scientifically proper methods and procedures and that any research papers were written using proper expressions based thereon.

2. The respondent, etc. may request for replicating experiments etc. in relation to the previous paragraph. If it is deemed necessary by the Expert Investigation Committee, the respondent must be given the rights guaranteed in paragraph 4 of Article 20.

(Procedures Related to Findings)

Article 26 1. The Expert Investigation Committee shall within 150 days from the start date of the formal investigation summarize the findings of the investigation, giving its determination as to whether research misconduct occurred or not.

2. Notwithstanding the previous paragraph, if there is a rational reason for being unable to reach a decision within the 150 days, the Expert Investigation Committee shall notify the Research Ethics Committee with the reason thereof and the new estimated date of decision and receive its approval for the postponement. The Chair of the Research Ethics Committee shall report this to the University President.

3. If it is determined that research misconduct occurred, the Expert Investigation Committee shall issue findings concerning the content and the degree of malicious nature of the misconduct, the persons involved in the research misconduct and the degree of their involvement, roles of each of the authors involved in any associated research paper(s) with regard to the research activities, and the paper(s) themselves, and other necessary matters.

4. If it is determined that research misconduct did not take place and the investigation shows that the allegation was lodged out of malice, the Expert Investigation Committee shall at the same time issue this as its finding.

5. In making a finding described in the previous paragraph, the complainant must be given the opportunity to offer a counterargument in writing or orally.

6. When the findings as per the paragraphs 2 and 3 above have been completed, the Expert Investigation Committee shall immediately issue a report to the Research Ethics Committee.

7. Upon receiving the report described in the previous paragraph, the Chair of the Research Ethics Committee shall immediately report the content of the report to the University President.

(Methods of Making a Determination)

Article 27 1. To determine whether there was research misconduct or not, the Expert Investigation Committee shall make a comprehensive assessment of the evidence obtained through the formal investigation, including the physical and scientific evidence, the testimony and any admission by the respondent, etc.

2. The Expert Investigation Committee may not determine that research misconduct occurred based solely on an admission by the respondent, etc.

3. If the suspicion of research misconduct described in items 1 to 4 of paragraph 2, Article 2 is not dispelled by the counterargument of the respondent, etc. or other evidence, the Expert Investigation Committee may determine that such research misconduct occurred. The same shall be true if the respondent, etc. does not present sufficient evidence to dispel the suspicion of research misconduct due to a lack of raw data, experimental and observation notes, test samples and reagents, related documents, or other key components of research that should normally exist.

(Decision, Notification, and Report)

Article 28 1. Based on the results of the investigation conducted by the Expert Investigation Committee, the Research Ethics Committee shall decide whether or not research misconduct occurred.

2. If the Expert Investigation Committee issued a finding described in paragraph 3 of Article 26, the Research Ethics Committee shall, based on the investigation results, decide if the allegation was lodged out of malice.
3. The Chair of the Research Ethics Committee shall report to the University President regarding the decisions described in the previous two paragraphs.
4. The University President shall promptly notify the decision described in paragraph 1 to the complainant, the respondent, etc. and persons other than the respondent, etc. who have been deemed to be the subject of the investigation based on their involvement in the research misconduct, as well as notify it to the persons to whom the report or the notification of conducting the formal investigation was sent based on paragraph 7 and 8 of Article 16 in the same manner.
5. Even if the report described in paragraph 8 of Article 16 was not sent regarding decision described in paragraph 1, the University President shall, if necessary, report the decision to related organizations and agencies. If the respondent, etc. is affiliated with an organization other than the University, notification shall be made also to that organization as necessary.
6. If it is determined that the allegation was lodged out of malice under paragraph 2, the University President shall notify the decision to the complainant and the respondent, as well as report/notify it to persons to whom the report or the notification of conducting the formal investigation was sent based on paragraph 7 and 8 of Article 16 in the same manner. If the complainant is affiliated with an organization other than the University, notification shall be made also to that organization.

(Objection Filing)

Article 29 1. If it is decided based on paragraph 5 of Article 16 that a formal investigation shall not be conducted, the complainant shall be able to file an objection to the Chair of the Research Ethics Committee within 14 days from the day the notification is received. It shall not be possible, however, to file repeated objections for the same reason, even if it is within the deadline. If the respondent cooperated in the preliminary investigation, a notification described in this paragraph shall be also sent to the respondent.

2. If it is decided based on paragraph 1 of the previous Article that research misconduct has occurred, the respondent, etc. shall be able to file an objection with grounds and in writing to the University President within 14 days from the day the notification described in paragraph 4 of the previous Article is received. It shall not be possible, however, to file repeated objections for the same reason, even if it is within the deadline.
3. If it is decided based on paragraph 2 of the previous Article that the allegation was lodged out of malice, the complainant shall be able to file an objection with grounds and in writing to the University President within 14 days from the day the notification described in paragraph 6 of the previous Article is received. It shall not be possible, however, to file repeated objections for the same reason, even if it is within the deadline.

4. If an objection described in paragraph 2 is filed, the University President shall notify the complainant of the objection, and notify persons to whom the report or the notification of research misconduct was sent based on paragraph 4 of the previous Article in the same manner.
5. If an objection described in paragraph 3 is filed, the University President shall notify the respondent, etc. of the objection, and notify persons to whom the report or the notification of the objection was set based on paragraph 6 of the previous Article.
6. If an objection described in paragraph 3 is filed by the complainant who is affiliated with an organization other than the University, the University President shall notify that organization of the objection.

(Examination of Validity of Objection)

Article 30 If the Research Ethics Committee received an objection based on paragraph 1 of the previous Article, it must deliberate whether to conduct a new formal investigation under the Research Ethics Committee to examine the validity of the objection.

2. If it is decided that a new formal investigation will not be conducted based on the previous paragraph, the complainant shall not be able to file any further objections.
3. If an objection based on paragraph 2 or 3 of the previous Article is filed, the University President shall establish the Objection Examination Committee, and the committee shall examine the validity of the objection as well as deliberate whether to conduct a new investigation.
4. The Objection Examination Committee shall consist of three members or more delegated by the University President and more than half of the members must be outside experts.
5. A member of the Expert Investigation Committee or the Research Ethics Committee may not be a member of the committee described in the previous paragraph.
6. The University President must notify the name and affiliation of the committee described in the paragraph 4 to the objector.
7. The objector to which the notification was sent out based on the previous paragraph shall be able to file an objection in regard to in writing to the University President concerning the committee members described in the paragraph 4 within 7 days from the day the notification is received.
8. If an objection described in the previous paragraph is filed, the University President must examine the details of the objection, and if the objection is deemed to be reasonable, the member concerned shall be replaced or new member(s) shall be added, and notification to this effect must be made to the objector. A notification must also be made to the objector in the case where the objection was deemed not to be reasonable.
9. It shall not be possible to file objections against the decision described in the previous paragraph.
10. If the Objection Examination Committee decides to reject the objection based on paragraph 2 or 3 of the previous Article without conducting a new investigation of the case or decides to conduct a new investigation in response to the objection, the decision must be reported immediately to the

University President.

11. Upon receiving the report described in the previous two paragraphs, the University President shall notify the objector and the organizations to which the report of the objection was sent based on paragraphs 4 to 6 of the previous Article in the same manner.

12. The objector shall not be able to file any further objections against the decision described in paragraph 10.

(New Investigation)

Article 31 1. If a decision is made to conduct a new investigation in response to the objection described in paragraph 10 of Article 30, the University President shall request a re-investigation carried out by the Expert Investigation Committee to the chair of the Research Ethics Committee.

2. If the objection filed as described in the previous paragraph necessitates a decision requiring new expertise, the Research Ethics Committee shall replace or add new Expert Investigation Committee members, or restructure the Expert Investigation Committee and have the investigation carried out by the restructured committee.

3. The appointment, etc. of new Expert Investigation Committee members described in the previous paragraph shall be carried out in accordance with Article 17 and 18.

4. The Expert Investigation Committee shall request the objector to submit materials that the objector considers sufficient for overturning the earlier investigation result, and to cooperate with the new investigation in other ways toward the prompt resolution of the case.

5. If the cooperation of the objector described in the previous paragraph is not obtained, the Expert Investigation Committee shall be able to terminate the procedures without conducting a new investigation.

6. The Expert Investigation Committee must report the decision described in the previous paragraph immediately to the Research Ethics Committee, and upon hearing the decision, the Chair of the Research Ethics Committee must report it to the University President. The University President shall notify the objector of the decision.

7. If the Expert Investigation Committee starts a new investigation in response to the objection described in paragraph 2 of Article 29, the committee must decide whether to overturn the earlier investigation result within 50 days from the start date of the new investigation.

8. If the Expert Investigation Committee starts a new investigation in response to the objection described in paragraph 3 of Article 29, the committee must decide whether to overturn the earlier investigation result within 30 days from the start date of the new investigation.

9. Notwithstanding the preceding two paragraphs, if there is a rational reason for being unable to reach a decision on whether to overturn the earlier investigation result within the period provided, the committee shall notify the Research Ethics Committee with the reason thereof and the new estimated date of decision and receive its approval for the postponement. The Chair of the Research

Ethics Committee shall report this to the University President.

10. The Expert Investigation Committee shall report to the Research Ethics Committee the results of the new investigation in response to the objection described in paragraph 2 or 3 of Article 29.

11. The Research Ethics Committee shall decide whether to change the decision described in paragraph 1 or 2 of Article 28 based on the results of the new investigation. The Chair of the Research Ethics Committee shall report this decision to the University President.

12. Based on the report described in the previous paragraph, the University President shall promptly notify the results of the new investigation to the complainant, the respondent, etc. and persons other than the respondent, etc. determined to have been involved in the research misconduct, as well as notify the results to persons to whom the report or the notification of the objection was sent based on paragraphs 4 to 6 of Article 29.

13. The objector shall not be able to file any further objections against the decision of the Research Ethics Committee as a result of the new investigation.

(Announcement of Investigation Results)

Article 32 1. When it is decided that research misconduct has occurred, the University President shall promptly announce the results of the investigation to the public.

2. The announcement described in the previous paragraph shall include the names and affiliations of the persons involved in the research misconduct, details of the misconduct, sanctions imposed by the University before the announcement, and the methods and procedures of the investigation.

3. Notwithstanding the provision of the previous paragraph, the names and affiliations of the persons involved in the research misconduct may not be made public if the research paper(s) determined to have been involved in research misconduct were withdrawn before the allegation was received, or for other reasons deemed necessary by the University President.

4. When it is decided that research misconduct has not occurred, the results of the investigation shall not be made public as a general rule. If, however, it is deemed necessary to restore the honor of the respondent, etc., the case under investigation has been leaked outside, or any errors that are neither intentional nor due to gross neglect of the basic duty of care expected of a researcher are found in research paper(s), the results of the investigation shall be made public.

5. The announcement of the case described in the proviso of the previous paragraph shall include that no research misconduct was found, that the research paper(s) contained errors that are neither intentional nor due to gross neglect of the basic duty of care expected of a researcher, as well as the name and affiliation of the respondent, etc. and the methods and procedures of the investigation.

6. If it is decided that the allegation was lodged out of malice, the University President shall make public the complainant's name and affiliation, the reason for determining that the allegation was lodged out of malice, and the methods and procedures of the investigation.

(Temporary Measures during Formal Investigation)

Article 33 1. The University President shall be able to take necessary measures against the respondent, etc., such as temporary suspension of research funding, during the period from when the decision is made to conduct a formal investigation until when the Expert Investigation Committee's report of the investigation results is received.

2 If the research funding organization has issued an order for suspension of relevant research funding to the respondent, etc. or other measures, the University President shall take such measures accordingly.

(Discontinuation of Use of Research Funds)

Article 34 The University President shall be able to order the persons determined to have committed the research misconduct, the persons determined to bear prime responsibility for the contents of any research paper(s) connected with the research misconduct, and persons determined to be responsible for use of all or part of the research funds (hereinafter collectively referred to as 'persons determined to be responsible for the misconduct') to stop using the research funds immediately.

(Recommendation of Withdrawal etc. of Research Papers)

Article 35 1. The University President shall recommend the persons determined to be responsible for the misconduct to withdraw or correct any research paper(s) determined to have been connected with research misconduct or make other recommendations.

2. The persons determined to be responsible for the misconduct must respond to the University President whether or not they intend to follow the recommendation described in the previous paragraph within 14 days from the day the recommendation is made.

3. If the persons determined to be responsible for the misconduct do not follow the recommendation of paragraph 1, the University President shall make it public.

(Lifting of Measures and Restoration of Honor)

Article 36 1. If it is decided that research misconduct did not take place, the University President shall lift the measures taken at the time of formal investigation such as suspension of research funding. With regard to the measure of preservation of evidence, it shall be lifted promptly after the deadline for filing an objection has passed or after the result of the examination of the objection is finalized.

2. The University President shall take measures to restore the honor of the person(s) determined to have not been involved in research misconduct and to protect the person(s) from being disadvantaged.

(Report of Penalties)

Article 37 1. If it is decided that research misconduct has occurred and any penalties are imposed on those who were involved in the research misconduct in accordance with the procedures stipulated in the Disciplinary Regulations etc., the University President shall report the details of the penalties to related organizations and agencies to which the report of occurrence of research misconduct was sent

based on paragraph 4 of Article 28 or the report of the results of the new investigation was sent based on paragraph 12 of Article 31.

2. If any penalties are imposed on the complainant in accordance with the procedures stipulated in the Disciplinary Regulations etc., following the decision that the allegation was lodged out of malice, the University President shall notify persons to whom the report or the notification described in paragraph 6 of Article 28 was sent in the same manner.

(Corrective Measures)

Article 38 1. If it is decided that research misconduct has occurred, the Research Ethics Committee shall be able to recommend the University President to promptly take corrective measures, measures to prevent recurrence and other necessary measures for environmental improvement (hereinafter collectively referred to as 'corrective measures etc.').

2. Based on the recommendation described in the previous paragraph, the University President shall order the dean or director of the relevant faculty or graduate school etc. to take corrective measures etc. The University President shall also take corrective measures etc. for the university as a whole.

3. The University President shall report the details of the corrective measures etc. taken based on the previous paragraph to the related organizations and agencies to which the report of occurrence of research misconduct was sent based on paragraph 4 of Article 28 or the report of the results of the new investigation was sent based on paragraph 12 of Article 31.

(Clerical Work)

Article 39 Clerical work relating to these policies shall be handled by the Office of the Ethics Review.

(Revision or Abolition)

Article 40 The revision or abolition of these policies shall be determined by the University President through the deliberation of the Research Ethics Committee and Directors Meeting.

Supplement

1. These policies shall take effect on the first day of April, 2023.

2. In addition to the provisions of these policies, MEXT's "Guidelines for Responding to Misconduct in Research" shall also be referred to when dealing with a case of research misconduct.