

# Etika Sebagai Penal Penilai

Norhamidi Muhammad  
Domain Teknologi & Kejuteraan



UNIVERSITI KEBANGSAAN MALAYSIA  
*The National University of Malaysia*

Inspiring Futures, Nurturing Possibilities



# Content

- ❑ **WHY RESEARCH ETHICS?**
- ❑ **VALUES IN RESEARCH ETHICS**
- ❑ **WHAT CONSTITUTES A QUALITY RESEARCH PROPOSAL?**
- ❑ **CORE PRINCIPLES OF PEER ASSESSMENT**
- ❑ **PANEL MEMBERS RESPONSIBLY**
- ❑ **WRITING THE CRITIQUE**

# Why Research Ethics?

- ❑ **Promote the aims of research**
- ❑ **Promote the values that are essential to collaborative work**
- ❑ **Accountability to the public**
- ❑ **Build public support, moral and social values**

# Why Research Ethics?..

- ❑ **Promote the aims of research**, such as expanding knowledge.
- ❑ Support the **values required for collaborative work**, such as mutual respect and fairness. This is essential because scientific research depends on collaboration between researchers and groups.
- ❑ Researchers can **be held accountable** for their actions. Many researchers are supported by public money, and regulations on conflicts of interest, misconduct, and research involving humans or animals are necessary to ensure that money is spent appropriately.
- ❑ Ensure that the **public can trust research**. For people to support and fund research, they have to be confident in it.
- ❑ Support important **social and moral values**, such as the principle of doing no harm to others.

# Values In Research Ethics

- Honesty**
- Objectivity**
- Integrity**
- Carefulness**
- Openness**
- Respect for Intellectual Property**
- Confidentiality**
- Responsible Publication**

# Values In Research Ethics..

## Responsible Mentoring

- Help to educate, mentor, and advise students..

- Promote their welfare and allow them to make their own decisions

## Respect for colleagues

- Respect your colleagues and treat them fairly.

## Social Responsibility

- Strive to promote social good and prevent or mitigate social harms through research, public education, and advocacy.

# Values in Research Ethics..

## Non-Discrimination

- Avoid discrimination against colleagues or students, gender, minorities, etc.

## Competence

- Maintain and improve your own professional competence and expertise through lifelong education and learning; take steps to promote competence in science as a whole.

## Legality

- Know and obey relevant laws and institutional and governmental policies.

# Values in Research Ethics..

## Animal Care

- Show proper respect and care for animals when using them in research. Do not conduct unnecessary or poorly designed animal experiments.

## Human Subjects Protection

- When conducting research on human subjects, minimize harms and risks and maximize benefits; respect human dignity, privacy, and autonomy; take special precautions with vulnerable populations; and strive to distribute the benefits and burdens of research fairly.

# What constitutes a quality research proposal?

- Articulates problem accurately**
- Provides appropriate background**
- Manageable within the time**
- Cost-effective**
- Linked to defined outcomes**
- Clear methodology**
- Seen to make a contribution to the field**
- Concise writing**
- Demonstrates right team approach**
- Has credible academic supervision**

# Core Principles of Peer Assessment

- Expertise in one or more areas of paper**
- Objectivity**
- No conflicts of interest**
- Good judgment**
- Able to think clearly and logically**
- Able to write a good critique**
- Accurate**
- Readable**
- Helpful to editors and authors**
- Able to do the review in the allotted time frame**
- Assessors must undertake all activities in a personal capacity and must not delegate**
- To respect the intellectual property of applicants and may not appropriate and use as their own.**

# Panel members responsibly

- ❑ **BPKI Panel members have been selected to conduct assessments because of their high level of expertise and leadership in the field.**
- ❑ **Panel members are responsible for:**
  - ❑ **Reading all applications.**
  - ❑ **Providing a score for each application, with reference to relevant selection criteria.**
  - ❑ **Providing notes and comments that may be suitable for feedback to applicants.**
  - ❑ **Participating in panel meeting discussion and deliberations.**
  - ❑ **Providing suggestions for the development of project applications which are conditionally recommended.**

# Panel members responsibly..

- ❑ **An assessor may feel bad about rejecting a proposal and empathize with the authors, but she/he must be able to make a recommendation for rejection when it is the appropriate one.**

## **Remember :**

- ❑ **You are the agent of BPKI, not the friend of the author**

# You should not..

- Discussing with your colleagues confidential information from a proposal that you are reviewing**
- Trimming budget without giving justifications**
- Making unauthorized copies of the proposal/taking it out of the evaluation area**
- Making derogatory comments and personal attacks in your review of applicant's submission**
- Expecting favours**
- Returning favours**
- Being racist in the evaluation**
- Rejecting a proposal for grant without even reading it**
- Sabotaging someone's proposal**

# Do you have any real or apparent conflicts of interest?

## Institutional affiliations

- Through current institution
- Past institution (recent enough to have close associations)
- Future institution (e.g. negotiating for a position)
- Consultant to applicant's institution

## Collaborators and colleagues

- How close?
- When?

## Other relationships with the authors

- Family
- Personal friends
- People you detest
- People you would be reluctant or afraid to give a harsh review

# Writing the critique

- ❑ Critiques can be difficult to write.
- ❑ They must be clear, concise and accurate.
- ❑ Although their primary purpose is to advise BPKI, comments to the author frequently are of value in guiding revision of the proposal for the same or a different grant and in suggesting ways to improve the project by the inclusion of additional information.
- ❑ Comments to the author may be very brief, especially in the case of an excellent, well prepared paper.
- ❑ They may be extensive if the assessor feels the proposal has valuable elements but requires extensive revisions to attempt future grant opportunities.

# Writing the critique..

- The assessor should remember that the review will be sent to the authors and that it should be written in a constructive and collegial tone.**
- The content should be constructive and informative.**
- Comments and recommendations should be clear and should be supported with citations to specific areas in the text of the proposal.**
- When the assessor's criticisms rely on or are supported by data in the literature, the assessor should provide citations to the relevant papers.**
- A good review should help the authors to think more clearly about their work and its design, execution, presentation and significance.**

# Rude reviews

- ❑ **Some assessors submit critiques that are so rude, snide, sarcastic, argumentative, or even obscene that they must be censored before being sent to the authors.**
- ❑ **Some are not transmitted, depriving the author of any beneficial insights the assessor might have had.**
- ❑ **Rudeness, personal criticism and 'coffee outlet' humor are never appropriate.**
- ❑ **Assessors should write critiques using a style and tone that they would want to see in the reviews that they or their trainees receive.**
- ❑ **Reviewers should remember that they are setting the standards of behaviour and collegiality for their field, as well as the standards of science.**



*Terima Kasih*



# ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

- ❑ **Profesor Dato' Dr Abu Bakar Abdul Majeed, Domain Sains Kesihatan dan Klinikal**
- ❑ **David B. Resnik (2015), What is Ethics in Research & Why is it Important? <http://www.niehs.nih.gov/research/resources/bioethics/bioethicist/>**
- ❑ **Shamoo A. and Resnik D. 2009. Responsible Conduct of Research, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press).**
- ❑ **Sara Rockwell, Ph.D. A Guide for Manuscript Reviewers: Overview. Departments of Therapeutic Radiology and Pharmacology, and Office of Scientific Affairs, Yale University School of Medicine.**

# Reviewee's Ethics

- Conducting a review of the literature that fails to acknowledge the contributions of other people in the field or relevant prior work**
- Stretching the truth on a grant application in order to convince reviewers that the project will make a significant contribution to the field**
- Stretching the truth on curriculum vita**
- Including a colleague as a co-researcher in return for a favour even though the colleague did not or is expected not to make a serious contribution to the proposal/project**
- Wasting animals in research**

# Reviewee's Ethics

- ❑ **Disrespectful of human subjects/vulnerable subjects**
- ❑ **No attempt to obtain institutional ethical approval, for animal or human study**
- ❑ **Plagiarising someone else's idea or proposal**
- ❑ **Exposing students and staff to biological/chemical risks in violation of institution's biosafety rules**
  
- ❑ **Single blind review**
- ❑ **Two panellists per proposal**

# Overcoming Ethical Dilemma

- Which choice could stand up to further publicity and scrutiny?**
- Which choice could you not live with?**
- Think of the wisest person you know. What would he or she do in this situation?**
- Which choice would be the most just, fair, or responsible?**
- Which choice will probably have the best overall consequences?**