

Tuesday late morning session Track C, Tuesday, Sep 23 2025, 11:30-13:00

Location: Seminar 5

Session: Trust in Science

Chair: Anni Sairio

OR-11

Searchable libraries of RI case reports and published decisions: how Scandinavia pioneers transparency, and a demo of a new Dutch tool

Lodewijk Pet¹, Kalle Videnoja², Bert Seghers³

¹Leiden University Medical Centre, Netherlands

²European Network of Research Integrity Offices, Finland

³Flemish Commission for Research Integrity, Belgium

Public transparency on investigated research integrity cases is immensely valuable. It sets expectations for those who consider reporting a malpractice, and it enables the scientific community to learn. Research on case reports can yield key recommendations for soft harmonization. These advantages still hold if the reports are anonymised. Even anonymised summaries carry many of these benefits.

However, public transparency is not the norm in European institutions and countries. With the exception of Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands, public reporting is still in a very immature stage across Europe. Even within one country, disagreement among institutions is possible about to which extent they should communicate openly about their cases (even about the number of them). That such openness is still in its infancy in France and Germany is because complaint handling there relies on mediation rather than a formal investigation by an advisory committee.

In the first half of this talk, we look at the openness of investigation results from an internationally comparative lens. Finland's second advisory body TENK discloses anonymised summaries of all the cases it has ruled on since 2010. The Swedish body NPOF has only existed since 2020 but has a database where you can read its 132 decisions in full, with only the names and identifiable passages erased. Norway has a similar situation. The Danish body on scientific misconduct combines both: it publishes all its own decisions in full but anonymised (only on FFP) and reports anonymised summaries of the cases handled by Danish institutions, who are required to report to the national body (only non-FFP).

In the second, we discuss current evolutions in the Netherlands, where the second advisory body LOWI also publishes opinions anonymised and in full. The first author is working on a jurisprudence platform that will enable searching and visualising all decisions from publicly available sources — both from institutional investigation committees as from LOWI. He will demonstrate this tool, giving descriptive insights into the cases of LOWI, and a dynamic figure showing the timelines of all these trajectories first-and-second-advice cases. This provides a clear, visual overview of how investigation processes unfold over time. Furthermore, it is demonstrated how one can sort, filter, or find specific cases and extract data from them.