2022-2023 ANNUAL REPORT
Report of the Research Integrity Officer
Dr. Christina Wolfson
Prepared September 2023

Introduction:

The *Regulations Concerning the Investigation of Research Misconduct* call for the Research Integrity Officer (RIO) to report annually to Senate and to the Board of Governors on the application of the Regulations. This is the fourteenth annual report presented to Senate and the Board of Governors in discharge of this obligation.

During this reporting time period, Professors Jeanne Paquette and Niky Kamran have been appointed to 3 year terms as Deputy Research Integrity Officers beginning June 15th, 2022 and September 1st 2022, respectively.

During this reporting period all meetings were held via Zoom.

Background:

The Regulations provide for an internal process for the assessment (referred to an "Inquiry") by the RIO (or Deputy RIO) and, where appropriate, the formal investigation (referred to as "Investigation") of allegations of research misconduct brought against members of the University community regardless of Faculty or discipline. The investigation committee membership and process to be followed are governed by the Regulations.

Tables 1, 2, and 3 below provide statistical information concerning allegations and their disposition for the past six academic years [2017-2018 to 2022-2023].

The Big Picture:

There were 7 new dossiers opened during the 2022-2023 reporting year, one additional dossier was carried over from the 2021-2022 reporting year. Of these 8 cases, 5 went to inquiry and 4 of the 5 went to Investigation or the inquiry ended as a result of an Admission of Research Misconduct by the Respondent. Two of the dossiers opened in this reporting year were ongoing at the end of the reporting period.

Table 1 below presents summary statistics on the Nature of the Allegations Received for the 7 new dossiers. It is not uncommon for a complaint to include more than one allegation of research misconduct. What is presented below is the "primary allegation" as determined by the RIO.

	Table 1: Nature of the Allegations Received						
	17/18	**18/19**	**19/20**	**20/21**	**21/22**	**22/23**	**Total**
Plagiarism or Authorship	2	0	4	3	5	2	16
Fabrication/ Falsification	0	1	1	2	2	2	8
Ethical Misconduct	2	1	2	3	2	3	13
Misrepresentation of Credentials	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Mismanagement of Research Funds	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Misappropriation of Intellectual Property		2	3	1	1	0	7
Mismanagement of Conflict of Interest		1	0	0	0	0	1
False Accusation of Research Misconduct		1	0	0	0	0	1
Destruction of Research Records				1	0	0	1
Libel				1	0	0	1
Total	**6**	**6**	**10**	**11**	**11**	**7**	**51**

The Source of Allegations:

The sources of allegations are shown in Table 2 (below). In line with past years, complaints come from a variety of sources, and we note this year that there was an increase in the number of anonymous allegations. Over the past 6 years the majority of the respondents (i.e. those against whom a complaint is made) have been academic staff, although graduate students/postdoctoral fellows have also been named as respondents. The RIO works closely with Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies when the respondent is a graduate student or postdoctoral fellow as per the Regulations.

	Table 2: Source of Allegations						
	17/18	**18/19**	**19/20**	**20/21**	**21/22**	**22/23**	**Total**
Funding Agency	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
University Community*	5	1	4	3	5	3	21
External**	0	5	4	6	3	2	20
Anonymous	1	0	1	1	3	2	8
Total	6	6	10	11	11	7	51

*Includes administrative units of the University, **Includes Journal editors, members of the lay public, researchers outside the McGill community.

Actions in Response to Allegations:

The first step following the receipt of an allegation is an inquiry conducted by the RIO or Deputy RIO. The possible outcomes of the RIO inquiry are (i) insufficient evidence to proceed to an investigation; (ii) admission of research misconduct; or (iii) sufficient evidence to proceed to an investigation. Inquiries only or Inquiries followed by Investigations have taken place in 41 cases over the past six years. Six cases were judged as prima facie (no basis for an inquiry or inadequate information to launch an inquiry). Four cases were transferred to other jurisdictions. Research misconduct (including admission of research misconduct) was established either through a formal investigation or an admission of research misconduct by the respondent in fourteen cases. There were two cases ongoing at the end of this reporting period.

Table 3: Actions in Response to Allegations

Nature of the Allegation	Year	Total Cases	No Prima Facie Case	Transferred*	Inquiry only OR Investigation	Finding of Research Misconduct
Plagiarism/Authorship	2017-18	2			2	
	2018-19	0			0	
	2019-20	4			4	
	2020-21	3	1		2	
	2021-22	5	1	2	2	
	2022-23	**2**	**1**		**1*****|	
Fabrication/Falsification	2017-18	0			0	
	2018-19	1		1	0	
	2019-20	1			1	
	2020-21	2			2	
	2021-22	2			2	
	2022-23	**2**			**2*****	
Ethical Misconduct	2017-18	2			2	
	2018-19	1			1	
	2019-20	2			2	
	2020-21	3			3	
	2021-22	2			2	
	2022-23	**3**	**2**		**1**	
Mismanagement of Research Funds	2017-18	1			1	
	2018-19	0			0	
	2019-20	0			0	
	2020-21	0			0	
	2021-22	1			1	
	2022-23	**0**			**0**	

Nature of the Allegation	Year	Total Cases	No Prima Facie Case	Transferred*	Inquiry only OR Investigation	Finding of Research Misconduct
Misrepresentation	2017-18	1			1	
	2018-19	0			0	
	2019-20	0			0	
	2020-21	0			0	
	2021-22	0			0	
	2022-23	**0**			**0**	
Mismanagement of Conflict of Interest	2018-19	1			1	
	2019-20	0			0	
	2020-21	0			0	
	2021-22	0			0	
	2022-23	**0**			**0**	
Misappropriation of Intellectual Property	2018-19	2		1	1	
	2019-20	3			3	
	2020-21	1			1	
	2021-22	1			1	
	2022-23	**0**			**0**	
False Accusation of Research Misconduct	2018-19	1			1	
	2019-20	0			0	
	2020-21	0			0	
	2021-22	0			0	
	2022-23	**0**			**0**	
Destruction of Research Records	2020-21	1			1	
	2021-22	0			0	
	2022-23	**0**			**0**	
Libel	2021-21	1	1		0	
	2021-22	0			0	
	2022-23	**0**			**0**	
Totals		**51**	**6**	**4**	**41**	**14**

*Allegations that upon review were transferred to other jurisdictions/universities and not managed through McGill University.
*** In each category one dossier is ongoing into the 2023-2024 reporting year.

Consultative Activities:

In addition to the formal allegations noted above, the RIO (or Deputy RIO) opened approximately a dozen files and held preliminary discussions with current or former members of the McGill community

who were concerned about an issue of research misconduct. No formal allegations of research misconduct were submitted to the RIO for any of these dossiers, these dossiers were closed.

Additional Statistical Reporting:

Each year in addition to the annual report to Senate, the RIO files the following annually:

(a) In accordance with the *Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research (2016)*, Article 4.5(b), institutions are required to report annually to the Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research matters involving Agency funding. This is a statistical report only.

(b) Each institution which receives or applies for US Public Health Service research funding must report to the US Office of Research Integrity concerning any allegations of research misconduct involving U.S. Public Health Service funded research. This is a statistical report only.

(c) For all allegations involving research funded by FRQ or in relation to allegations against a member of the McGill community based at an FRQ funded research institute, a letter, devoid of personal information must be forwarded to the FRQ with the decision concerning the disposition of the allegation (i.e. insufficient evidence to proceed to an investigation; admission of guilt; or sufficient evidence to proceed to an investigation).

Acknowledgements:

The Research Integrity Officer and Deputy Research Integrity Officers take this opportunity to thank all those who have served on, or cooperated with, investigation committees. This includes members of the McGill University Community as well as those from outside the University who have served as external members or consultants. All recognize the critical importance of such allegations and the major impact that they can have on the academic and professional lives of both respondents and complainants. The dedication that committee members as well as advisors, both faculty and students, have exhibited in these important roles, the integrity with which they have fulfilled their responsibilities, and the time and energy they have devoted to ensuring a fair and transparent investigation of all the issues deserve commendation. The RIOs extend their gratitude to the University and its members for the opportunity to have served in this capacity and for their cooperation and support.