

**ANNUAL REPORT OF  
THE FINNISH NATIONAL  
BOARD ON RESEARCH  
INTEGRITY TENK  
2022**



FINNISH NATIONAL BOARD ON  
RESEARCH INTEGRITY TENK

# CONTENTS

<b>1. Objectives and tasks of TENK</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Promotion of research integrity</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1. Responsible conduct of research (RCR)	<b>6</b>
2.2. Research integrity advisers	<b>7</b>
2.3. Communications and information	<b>7</b>
2.4. Events	<b>8</b>
<b>3. Handling alleged violations of responsible conduct of research</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1. Allegations of RCR misconduct reported to TENK and verified violations	<b>9</b>
3.2. Verified RCR violations at research organisations	<b>10</b>
3.3. RCR statements requested from and issued by TENK	<b>11</b>
3.4. Summaries of RCR statements issued by TENK	<b>12</b>
<b>4. Ethical review</b>	<b>17</b>
4.1. Coordination of ethical review in human sciences	<b>17</b>
4.2. Statements for ethical review in human sciences requested from and issued by TENK	<b>19</b>
4.3. Ethical questions on the research of natural and environmental sciences	<b>20</b>
<b>5. International activities</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>6. Personnel and finances</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1</b>	Teaching, presentations and requested speeches related to research integrity
	<b>24</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2</b>	Publications related to research integrity, interviews given by TENK representatives and other media presence related to research integrity
	<b>27</b>
<b>APPENDIX 3</b>	Chairmanships and memberships of ethics committees and similar bodies
	<b>28</b>
<b>APPENDIX 4</b>	Ethics Day 2022: International dimensions of research integrity
	<b>30</b>

## 1.

# OBJECTIVES AND TASKS OF TENK

THE FINNISH NATIONAL BOARD ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY TENK is an expert body appointed by the Ministry of Education and Culture in Finland, which handles ethical issues concerning research. Its task is to promote responsible conduct of research and to prevent research misconduct (Decree on the Advisory Board on Research Integrity 1347/1991). In addition, according to the Decree, TENK is tasked to 1) make proposals and issue statements to the authorities on legislative matters and other issues related to research integrity, 2) act as an expert body when investigating problems related to research integrity, 3) take initiatives to promote research integrity and promote discussion on research integrity in Finland, 4) monitor international development in the relevant field and actively participate in international cooperation, and 5) carry out communications related to research integrity.

The Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK carries out the tasks assigned to it by ensuring the ethical nature and quality of research by preventing research misconduct in all fields of science. TENK prepares national guidelines, organises seminars and promotes education, coordinates the ethical evaluation of human sciences, builds networks and maintains a presence both nationally and internationally. In addition, TENK oversees research integrity by monitoring and compiling statistics on violations of research integrity, by issuing statements on the investigation of alleged violations of research integrity and providing advice when problems arise. The implementation of these tasks is discussed in more detail in chapters 2–6.

The Ministry of Education and Culture appoints the members of TENK for a three-year term based on a proposal from the scientific community. During the term of office that ended on 31 January 2022, Professor **Riitta Keiski**, Dean of the University of Oulu served as Chair and Professor **Erika Löfström** from the University of Helsinki served as Vice Chair. In addition, TENK had eight other members:

- Chief Researcher **Kari Hämäläinen**,  
VATT Institute for Economic Research
- General Counsel **Matti Karhunen**,  
VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland Ltd

- Development Director **Leena Liimatainen**, JAMK University of Applied Sciences
- Senior Advisor **Susanna Näreaho**, Metropolia University of Applied Sciences
- Professor **Riitta Salmelin**, Aalto university
- Vice President **Sirpa Thessler**, Natural Resources Institute Finland
- Assistant Professor **Aleksi Tornio**, University of Turku
- Professor **Risto Turunen**, University of Eastern Finland

The Ministry of Education and Culture appointed the new National Board on Research Integrity for the term 1 February 2022 – 31 January 2025. Riitta Keiski will continue as Chair, and Sirpa Thessler from the Natural Resources Institute Finland was elected as Vice Chair. In addition, TENK had eight other members:

- Manager (Responsible Research and Innovation) **Veikko Ikonen**, VTT
- University Lecturer **Simo Kyllönen**, University of Helsinki
- Professor **Jari Laurikka**, University of Tampere
- University Lecturer **Matti Muukkonen**, University of Eastern Finland
- Senior Advisor **Susanna Näreaho**, Metropolia University of Applied Sciences
- Professor **Riitta Salmelin**, Aalto University
- Assistant Professor **Aleksi Tornio**, University of Turku
- Professor **Risto Turunen**, University of Eastern Finland

Chancellor Emerita **Krista Varantola** serves as permanent expert on the Board. TENK Secretary General, Docent **Sanna-Kaisa Spoo**, serves as secretary.



*Figure 1: The Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK during the term of office from 1 February 2022 to 31 January 2025. Photograph by Jaakko Lukumaa.*

TENK met eight times during 2022. The meetings were mainly held remotely. The meeting in December was held at the University of Turku in connection with TENK's visit to Turku on 14–15 December 2022.

TENK celebrated its 30th anniversary on 13 June 2022 in Seurasaari, Helsinki. Mr **Isidoros Karatzas**, Head of Research Ethics & Integrity at the European Commission, was the keynote speaker at the event.

TENK members were active in both national and local ethics committees and working groups (ANNEX 3).



*Figure 2: Mr Isidoros Karatzas, Head of Research Ethics & Integrity at the European Commission, joined TENK's 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary in Seurasaari as keynote speaker. Pictured with TENK Chair Riitta Keiski and TENK member Risto Turunen. Photograph by Jaakko Lukumaa.*

## 2.

# PROMOTION OF RESEARCH INTEGRITY

## 2.1. RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH (RCR)

TENK's preventative ethical guidelines *Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland. The Guidelines of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity 2012* (the so-called RCR guidelines) provide all researchers with a model of research integrity. The objective of these guidelines is to promote research integrity and to prevent misconduct in research in all organisations that are involved in and support research work, such as universities, research institutes and universities of applied sciences.

The effectiveness of the RCR guidelines is based on a voluntary commitment by the research community to adhere to the guidelines and to increase awareness of the principles of research integrity. The RCR guidelines apply to all academic disciplines in Finland, and all universities, universities of applied sciences, nearly all publicly funded research institutions and entities such as the Academy of Finland, Business Finland, the Prime Minister's Office and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry have *committed to following* them. All in all, the RCR guidelines apply to approximately 25,000–30,000 members of the scientific and research community in Finnish universities, universities of applied sciences and research institutions.

In 2022, TENK finished the updating process of the RCR guidelines. Feedback on the draft versions of the new guideline was extensively collected from the scientific and research community, and an *official request for statements was published on the State Administration's Lausuntopalvelu.fi* website in November. The request was sent to all parties committed to the current guidelines as well as ministries and other key actors of scientific policy. A total of 63 statements were received, and the texts of the guideline were finalised at the end of the year based on the statements. The new RCR guideline will be published in connection with the Ethics Day seminar in March 2023.

The working group responsible for the update included TENK members **Riitta Keiski, Erika Löfström, Susanna Näreaho, Kari Hämäläinen** and

**Matti Karhunen** and permanent expert **Krista Varantola**. The update work was coordinated by **Sanna-Kaisa Spooft, Iina Kohonen, Terhi Tarkiainen, Minna Aittasalo** and **Eero Kaila** from the TENK Secretariat.

## 2.2. RESEARCH INTEGRITY ADVISERS

TENK has coordinated the activities of Research Integrity Advisers for five years now. The premise for the network of Research Integrity Advisers included the need to strengthen awareness of research integrity in Finland among the increasingly international research community. By the end of 2022, the network of Research Integrity Advisers included 75 research organisations and 154 integrity advisers.

Research Integrity Advisers' most important task is to provide confidential advice to the staff of their organisation in suspected violations of research integrity. The hope is also that Research Integrity Advisers will lower the threshold of submitting notifications of suspected RCR violations.

TENK annually organises various training and networking events for the Research Integrity Advisers. In 2022, these events were organised online in March, May and December. Topics included Research Integrity Advisers' activities in practice, work community mediation and whistleblowing. The Research Integrity Advisers were also presented the Research Integrity Barometer and the updated RCR guideline.

The annual survey for Research Integrity Advisers received 49 responses (with a response rate of 32%). As before, Research Integrity Advisers' tasks in 2022 mainly included offering advice and information on research integrity, and there were relatively few alleged RCR violations and RCR processes.

Erika Löfström from the University of Helsinki ended her term as Chair of the Research Integrity Advisers' Development Group at the end of 2022.

## 2.3. COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION

The task of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK is to communicate about matters of research integrity. TENK communicates about its activities and guidelines on research integrity in Finnish, Swedish and English on [its website](#), on the [Responsible Research website](#) and in [its TENK tiedottaa newsletter](#). In addition, TENK members and Secretariat present and bring awareness to TENK's activities and questions on research integrity by giving seminar presentations (APPENDIX 1), publishing articles and giving interviews (APPENDIX 2). TENK also organises various expert events aimed at the research community (see section 2.4.).

The *TENK tiedottaa* newsletter is sent to all organisations committed to the TENK guidelines and their management, Research Integrity Advisers

and other stakeholders and the TENK email list 2 to 5 times a year. In 2022, the *TENK tiedottaa* newsletter was published in June and October. The purpose of the newsletter is to communicate to stakeholders about the topical matters and issues related to TENK as well as topics related to research integrity and responsible research in a broader sense.

The TENK Secretariat continued to prepare the *Research Integrity Barometer*. A steering group was set up to support this work, chaired by Riitta Keiski, TENK Chair. The Barometer questionnaire was prepared on the basis of the 2018 pilot. The Barometer coordinator was TENK Coordinator **Anni Sairio**.

## 2.4. EVENTS

TENK worked with other national boards on research integrity to organise Ethics Day 2022 on 15 March 2022 (APPENDIX 4). Ethics Day is a multi-disciplinary seminar on research integrity, which has brought together representatives of different academic disciplines since 2011. This time, the theme of the seminar was the international dimensions of research integrity. The event was launched with a video greeting by European Commissioner **Jutta Urpilainen**. Ethics Day also saw presentations by **Riitta Keiski, Jaana Hallamaa, Johanna Kivimäki, Liisa Laakso, Päivi Tikka, Kalle Videnoja, Marko Ahteensuu, Markku Leskelä, Erika Löfström, Terhi Kilpi** and **Krista Varantola**. There were 300 registered participants for the online Ethics Day event.

There were two workshops in addition to the actual seminar programme. A workshop led by **Raija Oikari**, Senior Specialist at the University of Jyväskylä, examined ethical aspects related to complementary funding in the European context. In a workshop led by TENK experts **Minna Aittasalo** and **Eero Kaila**, participants reflected on ways to promote the adoption of the new RCR guideline.



## 3.

# HANDLING ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH

## 3.1. ALLEGATIONS OF RCR MISCONDUCT REPORTED TO TENK AND VERIFIED VIOLATIONS

In 2022, a total of 31 new allegations of misconduct in the responsible conduct of research (RCR) were reported to TENK by Finnish universities, universities of applied sciences and other research organisations committed to the RCR guidelines. Five of these concerned Master's theses in universities of applied sciences.

According to the notifications received by TENK, 16 RCR processes were completed during the year, some of which had already been started in the preceding years. Of these, 13 concerned cases investigated in universities or other organisations and three concerned Master's theses in universities of applied sciences. The allegations were investigated with the RCR process in the organisation where the research or thesis under suspicion was being or had been carried out.

Only two RCR violations were found in 2022, one of them concerning plagiarism in a Master's thesis at a university and the other concerning plagiarism in a Master's thesis at a university of applied sciences. The investigations of five alleged cases were closed because they were not considered to be matters covered by the RCR guidelines.

Summaries of verified RCR violations are in section 3.2.

<b>Allegations of RCR misconduct reported to TENK and verified violations, no.</b> (number of cases concerning UAS Master's theses shown in parentheses)	<b>2022</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2018</b>
Reports from research organisations to TENK on new allegations of RCR misconduct	31 (5)	53 (10)	43 (2)	34 (13)	40 (16)
Research organisations' finalised RCR processes with a verified RCR violation of: <b>misconduct</b>	2 (1)	5 (2)	6 (3)	13 (9)	12 (7)
Research organisations' finalised RCR processes with a verified RCR violation of: <b>disregard</b>	0	3 (1)	9 (2)	6 (4)	7 (0)
Research organisations' finalised RCR processes with no verified RCR violation	9 (0)	21 (3)	24 (0)	22 (6)	15 (0)

*Table 1: RCR allegations of misconduct reported to the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK and verified RCR violations, number (number of cases concerning UAS Master's theses shown in parentheses).*

## **3.2. VERIFIED RCR VIOLATIONS AT RESEARCH ORGANISATIONS**

### **3.2.1. Case 1: Plagiarism found in a Master's thesis at a higher education institution**

An assistant professor at a higher education institution suspected that a student had committed plagiarism in their Master's thesis. The preliminary inquiry conducted by the higher education institution found that the suspicion had been justified due to inadequate references in the thesis. However, the act was not considered a serious violation of research integrity, which is why the student was granted the opportunity to correct their thesis.

\*\*\*

The other RCR violation reported to TENK in 2022 concerned plagiarism in a Master's thesis at a university of applied sciences.

### 3.3. RCR STATEMENTS REQUESTED FROM AND ISSUED BY TENK

In 2022, TENK received a total of eight new requests for a statement related to the investigation process of alleged violations of research integrity. Due to the exceptionally high number of requests for statements received in the previous year, TENK continued to clear the backlog in 2022 and issued a total of 19 RCR statements during the year.

In addition, TENK received two requests for statements concerning preliminary assessment statements issued by a human science ethics committee. The summaries of statements issued by TENK to these statements for ethical review in human sciences are presented in section 4.2.

Due to the large number of requests for statements under consideration, the processing time of five months in accordance with the RCR guidelines was exceeded in some cases. To alleviate the backlog, TENK held one extra meeting in September.

The summaries of statements issued by TENK in 2022 are presented in section 3.4. The summaries are also published on the [TENK website](#).

<b>TENK's statements, no</b> (number of statements requested and issued concerning UAS Master's theses shown in parentheses)	<b>2022</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2018</b>
New requests for a statement received by TENK that concerned the RCR process	8 (0)	37 (7)	14 (2)	23 (10)	16 (2)
Statements issued by TENK that concerned the RCR process; also including different requests for a statement other than those found in the previous section	19 (0)	22 (0)	13 (0)	22 (12)	9 (0)
Expert statements not concerning the RCR processes	1	1	7	1	2

*Table 2: Number of statements issued by the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK (number of statements requested and issued concerning UAS Master's theses shown in parentheses).*

### 3.4. SUMMARIES OF RCR STATEMENTS ISSUED BY TENK

#### **Statement 1 (TENK 2022:1): Researchers must ensure that information about them in public expert profiles is accurate.**

Professor A suspected that university director B was guilty of both misappropriation of another researchers' work and exaggeration of their CV because B had publications in their Google Scholar profile that they had not been a part of. Based on the preliminary inquiry, the suspicion proved to be unfounded. Professor A was dissatisfied with the conclusion of the RCR process and requested a statement from TENK.

According to TENK, exaggeration in a CV is included in other irresponsible practices according to the RCR 2012 guidelines. Such a case could only be assessed as an RCR violation if it constituted severe misconduct.

In its statement, TENK agreed with the assessment of the person conducting the preliminary inquiry that the contested publications had ended up in B's profile by Google Scholar's automated search. In addition, as B had not further used this incorrect list of publications, for example by referring to it in job or funding applications, there was no reason to suspect an RCR violation. However, TENK agreed with A's view that B as a researcher had been responsible for the accuracy and up-to-datedness of the information published in their public profile.

#### **Statement 5 (TENK 2022:5): Omission from the list of authors or not being named in an introduction did not prove to be RCR violations**

Researcher A submitted a report of a suspected RCR violation to the rector of the university, stating that researchers B and C in the field of humanities were guilty of disregard for the responsible conduct of research. The alleged disregard manifested as the denigration of other researchers, as B and C had failed to name A as the third author of the article anthology and A's contribution had not been mentioned in the introduction to the publication.

The conclusion of the investigation proper was that researchers B and C could not be considered to have denigrated the work input of researcher A to such an extent that it constituted an RCR violation. Researcher A was dissatisfied with the decision and requested a statement from TENK.

TENK found that both the RCR guidelines and TENK's recommendation on agreeing on authorship should have been followed when producing the anthology. However, the failure to mention researcher A as an author did not constitute gross disregard. TENK also considered that researcher A's input should have been mentioned in the introduction, but the failure to mention it also did not constitute the kind of gross negligence and carelessness that would meet the criteria of an RCR violation.

### **Statements 7 and 8 (TENK 2022:7 and 2022:8): Rejection of an article in the peer review process was not an RCR violation**

Researcher A suspected that social sciences researcher B and university lecturer C had committed an RCR violation when rejecting A's article manuscript. B and C worked at different universities, so A had filed notifications of alleged misconduct with the same content to both universities.

A stated that B and C had rejected the article written by A in a journal where B and C were editors. By doing so, they allegedly made A's work as a researcher delayed and more difficult. Researcher A further claimed that B and C had a conflict of interest as members of the editorial staff.

In their decisions made on the basis of the preliminary inquiry, the universities found that the researchers had not committed RCR violations. Researcher A submitted requests for statement from TENK on the universities' decisions.

According to TENK, publication channels have the right to decide on their publication principles. In this case, it was a case of genuine scientific disagreement on interpretation and evaluation, which, according to the RCR guidelines, are part of scientific discourse and do not violate responsible conduct of research. No investigation proper was necessary due to this reason.

In its statements, TENK found that the RCR process had been carried out at both universities in accordance with TENK guidelines.

### **Statement 11 (TENK 2022:11): Omitted reference did not meet the criteria of research misconduct**

Researcher A at a research institute suspected that researcher B in the same research group had acted in a misleading manner towards their research community and funders. According to A, B had presented their project to stakeholders, but the presentation was missing a necessary reference.

On the basis of the preliminary inquiry, it was undeniable that B had been guilty of disregard for the responsible conduct of research. B had admitted to having acted carelessly and had started to take corrective action. For these reasons, TENK found that an investigation proper was not necessary.

In its statement, TENK also found that the research institute had carried out the RCR process in accordance with TENK's guidelines.

### **Statement 14 (TENK 2022:14): Finnish researcher was not responsible for RCR violations suspected by a foreign professor**

Professor A from a foreign university suspected that Finnish technology researcher B who had worked under A's guidance was guilty of misappropriation, the denigration of other researchers and the manipulation of authorship in a manuscript that B had offered for publication in a scientific journal after returning to Finland. Professor A's allegations of RCR violations were

processed in a preliminary inquiry by the research organisation to which B had returned from the foreign university.

After an exceptionally comprehensive preliminary inquiry, the director of the research organisation decided that no RCR violations had been committed with regard to the manuscript and that there was no reason to initiate an investigation proper. Professor A was dissatisfied with the decision and requested a statement from TENK.

TENK found that the preliminary inquiry commissioned from an external expert was carried out in accordance with TENK's guidelines and that B had not committed any RCR violations.

**Statement 15 (TENK 2022:15): TENK did not comment on a matter of scientific policy**

In their request for a statement, humanities docent A expressed their dissatisfaction with the RCR process carried out at the university, where an RCR violation had been found concerning a book written by A. Docent A asked for TENK's statement on whether A's field of research differs from other scientific research with regard to diligence requirements and whether the investigation committee that investigated A's case had prepared their final report in accordance with the RCR guidelines.

It was TENK's interpretation that the question about the field of research concerned scientific policy, which is why TENK did not comment on it. In addition, TENK found that the RCR process had been carried out in accordance with TENK guidelines at the university.

**Statement 18 (TENK 2022:18): Not using p values provided as additional information in an article was not an RCR violation**

Professor A suspected that researcher B in the field of human sciences and assistant professor C at university X were guilty of falsification. During the process of writing their comment article, B and C had contacted A about the results of analyses that A and another author D had not reported in their original publication. Professor A had sent the p-values of two statistical correlation tests to B and C. B had asked A whether A could also share the research data with B so that B and C could interpret the p-values obtained from A. A refused to share the material. B and C did not mention the p-values sent by A in their article because they could not verify the p-values by examining the material used.

University X decided that B and C had not committed a violation of responsible conduct of research. In their request for a statement, A considered that it is a well-established practice that comment articles use the results of

statistical analyses without seeing the actual research data and asked TENK to comment on whether B and C were guilty of the falsification of research results.

TENK agreed with the decision of University X. According to TENK, researchers are not obliged to publish under their name p-values they have received without the possibility to view the material from which the values have been calculated.

**Statement 19 (TENK 2022:19): Disregard in the reference practices of a method section did not meet the criteria of research misconduct**

Researcher A at a research institute suspected that principal investigator B in their research group had plagiarised parts of their joint article in the field of technology in B's publication. According to A, B had also misappropriated material from an earlier joint article without giving recognition to the co-authors and using this material in another article. In addition, A pointed out that the structures of two sections of text were almost identical in the two above-mentioned articles.

TENK found that although it was indisputable that B had been guilty of disregard for the responsible conduct of research, it was not a case of research misconduct. As B had admitted the deed and taken corrective action, an investigation proper was not considered necessary.

**Statement 20 (TENK 2022:20): Shortcomings in the hearing practice of an investigation proper**

A group of researchers suspected that a non-fiction book published by Professor A and Docent B in the field of humanities included plagiarism and so-called self-plagiarism. In its preliminary inquiry, the university decided that A and B were guilty of disregard for the responsible conduct of research but that the severity of the act did not constitute plagiarism. Due to the work being a republication, no self-plagiarism was found either. After receiving TENK's statement, the university launched an investigation proper into the matter, as according to TENK, the suspicion of research misconduct could not be completely ruled out. The conclusion of the investigation proper was that B was guilty of plagiarism. With regard to A, the investigation was suspended.

In their request for a statement, A expressed their dissatisfaction with the working methods of the investigation committee due to the committee not granting A additional time for commenting, among other things. In its statement, TENK found that A's request for additional time had been justified. Although the 2012 RCR guidelines do not include a recommendation on the length of the response time granted to the parties of the RCR process, the investigation committee did not fully hear A as required by the RCR guidelines.

**Statement 21 (TENK 2022:21): TENK could not rule out an RCR violation concerning materials used in a conference presentation**

Based on a conference abstract published by technology professor A and doctoral researcher B at university X, a research group in the field of natural sciences suspected that the presentation had included material collected by researchers at X without permission. In its preliminary inquiry, university Y decided that A and B had been guilty of irresponsible conduct but that the severity of the act did not constitute an RCR violation.

In their request for a statement to TENK, the researchers of university X expressed their dissatisfaction with the completed RCR process and the fact that no RCR violation was found. The researchers requesting the statement considered that an investigation proper should be initiated in the matter.

After examining the materials, TENK could not rule out an RCR violation concerning the materials used in the conference presentation. Therefore TENK stated that the university should launch an investigation proper in accordance with the RCR process.



## 4

# ETHICAL REVIEW

## 4.1. COORDINATION OF ETHICAL REVIEW IN HUMAN SCIENCES

TENK coordinates ethical review in human sciences and promotes cooperation between regional and organisation-specific human science ethics committees.

When requested by researchers, human science ethics committees issue ethical review statements concerning the ethical aspects of research plans and other risks in research. The statements are based on TENK's guidelines *The ethical principles of research with human participants and ethical review in the human sciences in Finland. Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK guidelines 2019* to which the organisations are committed. The guidelines have been prepared together with the scientific community.

TENK's office monitors the state of ethical review by collecting data on cases processed by human science ethics committees annually and maintaining a list of the committees' contact information. At the end of 2022, a total of 77 organisations were committed to TENK's ethical principles for human sciences.

There is a constant rise in the need for ethical reviews. The growth is partly explained by committees having to process one request for a statement several times, either because of the corrections requested or because of changes in the research project in question. Completely negative statements are issued very rarely. In situations where an ethical review is not needed according to the TENK guidelines but, for example, the publisher requires one, the committees primarily provide descriptions of the Finnish ethical review system, but some publishers still require an ethical review statement. Researchers need support, especially in matters related to research permits and the processing of personal data. Projects subject to requests for statements are increasingly multidisciplinary and multifaceted, which the committees find challenging.

<b>Cases handled by human science ethics committees, no.</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2018</b>
Requests for statement related to ethical reviews	690	589	432	432	468
Statements given by ethics committees	611	582	395	389	457
Negative statement <sup>1</sup>	4	3	7	0	13
No statement (ethical review not considered necessary or request for statement directed to another committee)	57	36	21	36	26
Organisations replying to TENK's follow-up survey, no.	25	34	25	27	24

*Table 3: Number of cases handled by human science ethics committees each year.*

If necessary, a statement can be requested from TENK on the decisions issued by human science ethics committees. At its anniversary meeting on 13 June 2022, TENK established a separate *department for ethical review in human sciences* to process related requests for statements and to prepare statements. After preparation, the statements are approved at a TENK meeting. The second task of the department is to develop the ethical review in human sciences and the work of the committees in the field in Finland and to monitor the international development of field-specific, non-medical research ethics.

TENK member Professor Risto Turunen was appointed as the chair of the department and Professor Riitta Salmelin as the vice chair. Other members include Manager Veikko Ikonen, Senior Advisor Susanna Näreaho and Secretary General Sanna-Kaisa Spoof. Senior Advisor Minna Aittasalo conducted the secretary's duties. The department held three meetings in 2022.

1 In 2019 and thereafter, a negative statement means that no positive statement could be given, or the required revisions have not been made to the research plan, or the requested additional material for the statement has not been delivered. Before 2019, the numbers also include cases where the request for statement returned with a demand for amendment.

## 4.2. STATEMENTS FOR ETHICAL REVIEW IN HUMAN SCIENCES REQUESTED FROM AND ISSUED BY TENK

TENK's guidelines *The ethical principles of research with human participants and ethical review in the human sciences in Finland* state that if a person who has requested an ethical review statement does not accept the proposed changes in the statement or the decision of the human sciences ethics committee, they may request a statement on the matter from TENK.

In 2022, TENK received two requests for statements related to ethical review in human sciences. Summaries of the issued statements are below.

### **Statement for ethical review in human sciences 1 (TENK 2022:6): Informed consent for participation was considered necessary in a study using register data**

A researcher requested a statement from a research ethics committee on the researcher's project that used register data and deviated from the practice of informed consent. A sample of young adults belonging to a particular risk group was to be included in the study group, and they would be randomised to the intervention group (new practice) and the reference group (current practice) after sampling. The differences between the groups would be researched by monitoring the register data.

The researcher submitted a total of three requests for statements to a research ethics committee. Each time, the committee's statement was conditionally positive with correction requirements. The greatest difference of opinion between the researcher and the committee was related to the need for informed consent. The researcher considered the study to be a register study that would not need consent, but the committee considered it more a randomised and controlled intervention study that would need the subjects' consent. After the consultation rounds, the researcher interrupted the processing in the research ethics committee and requested a statement from TENK.

In its statement, TENK recommended the use of informed consent for participation in the research project. In addition, TENK's view was that the researchers should provide clearer and more concrete justifications on how the study would not cause more harm to any person suitable for the sample compared to their current situation. Finally, TENK considered that the research ethics committee had carried out the ethical review in accordance with the TENK guidelines and clearly presented to the researchers their decisions and the need for additional justifications.

**Statement for ethical review in human sciences 2 (TENK 2022:16):  
The principles of research ethics and ethical review should also be applied to research carried out in a development project**

A research group requested an ethical review statement from a research ethics committee on a study done with an electronic survey, which partly targeted adolescents aged under 15. The study was planned to be part of a broader development project. The researchers were meant to receive responses from adolescents who gave their informed consent in the survey to using their responses. However, the same responses would also go to the development project where no research integrity guidelines would apply. The researchers would therefore not be able to ensure the implementation of ethical principles with regard to their research material that was transferred to the development project.

Mainly for the above-mentioned reason, the research ethics committee did not give the research group a positive ethical review statement. The research group was dissatisfied with the committee's view and requested a statement on the matter from TENK.

In its statement, TENK agreed with the research ethics committee's view that the discussed part of a research project should comply with research integrity guidelines despite the fact that the research is carried out as part of development activities. TENK considered that the research group should pay particular attention to informing the research subjects and their guardians as well as the processing and management of the material collected for the study. In addition, TENK commented on the research group's shortcomings related to the request for a statement on research ethics and the research ethics committee's shortcomings related to the statement.

### **4.3. ETHICAL QUESTIONS ON THE RESEARCH OF NATURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES**

With the Do No Significant Harm principle (DNSH) adopted by the EU, more attention has been paid to the environmental impact of science and research. In Finland, several parties have begun to prepare an ethical review related to the research of natural and environmental sciences.

In autumn 2022, TENK carried out a needs assessment to examine the need for ethical review and national ethical principles for research in biosciences, environmental sciences, natural sciences and technology in Finland. Any research focusing on the environment, nature or a part of them was included in the scope of the assessment. The aim was to find out what kinds of views and needs related to research integrity in the aforementioned fields would be identified by experts working in different organisations and what kind of national coordination work was considered necessary in related cooperation.

TENK also organised two discussion events related to the assessment: *Tutkimusetiikka luonnontieteissä ja ympäristöntutkimuksessa (Research integrity in natural sciences and environmental research)* 11 May 2022 and *Luonnon ja ympäristön tutkimuksen etiikkaa (Ethics in the research of natural and environmental sciences)* 9 November 2022.

The review was mainly done through expert interviews and a survey targeting learned societies in natural and environmental sciences. The assessment was the responsibility of TENK experts **Veera Launis** and **Eero Kaila**. The review of the need for national ethical principles and ethical review for the research of natural and environmental sciences will be published in early 2023.

## 5.

# INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

TENK HAS BECOME a sought-after partner in international development projects in the field of research integrity. TENK participates in the EU's Horizon Europe project PREPARED, which was launched in September 2022. The three-year project aims to create ethical guidelines for research done in times of crisis when results need to be made available on an accelerated schedule. The guidelines created in the project should also be applicable to non-biomedical and non-medical research, and TENK plays a key role in this task.

In spring 2022, TENK participated in the EU's Horizon Europe project application consortium BEYOND. The project aims to provide a behavioural-scientific overview of institutional and researcher career path factors that can encourage research misconduct and to create models for dismantling these factors. The project was granted funding from 2023 to 2026. TENK's main task is to take care of communication and dissemination work.

TENK Secretary General **Sanna-Kaisa Spoof** was President of the European Network of Research Integrity Offices (ENRIO) until 28 April 2022. TENK Coordinator of International Affairs **Kalle Videnoja** served as secretary at ENRIO. At the end of 2022, ENRIO had 32 member organisations from different European countries. The TENK Secretariat hosted ENRIO's annual meeting in Helsinki on 28–29 April 2022. TENK is one of the founding members of the ENRIO association that resulted from the network, together with approximately 15 other European national bodies for research integrity.

Work for ENRIO's online publication *Research Integrity Practice in Europe* (RIPE) was begun at TENK. RIPE provides information on research integrity in Europe especially for research integrity experts, and it also serves as a publication channel for the ENRIO Congress that is organised every other year. Efforts during this year included creating RIPE's website and graphic design, drawing up editorial principles, forming the editorial board and requesting article submissions for the first issue. RIPE will be published in 2023.

The Lead Editor of RIPE is TENK Coordinator **Anni Sairio**.

## 6.

**PERSONNEL AND FINANCES**

IN 2022, members of the Secretariat of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK included **Sanna-Kaisa Spoof**, PhD, Secretary General, Docent, and **Iina Kohonen**, DFA, Senior Adviser (until 31 January 2022). During Kohonen's leave of absence, expert **Eero Kaila** from VTT acted as the substitute. Docent **Minna Aittasalo**, DHSc, worked as an expert. The Secretariat also included **Anni Sairio**, PhD, Coordinator, Docent, and **Kalle Videnoja**, MSc, International Affairs Coordinator.

Assistant **Lien Nguyen**, MSc, assisted with international affairs (until 15 February 2022). **Veera Launis**, MA, acted as temporary expert at TENK (from 1 July to 31 December 2022).

Planning Officer **Terhi Tarkiainen**, MA, (from 1 September 2022) and Office Secretary **Kaisu Reiss**, Bsc (Econ) worked part-time at the Secretariat. During Tarkiainen's leave of absence, the substitute was **Meri Vainiomäki**, MA (until 31 August 2022).

The TENK Secretariat worked at the location of the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies (TSV) at Snellmaninkatu 13, Helsinki. In August 2022, the Secretariat moved to TSV's new premises at Kirkkokatu 6, Helsinki. In addition to office space, TSV provides TENK with financial and HR administration and IT services.

TENK had at its disposal a general grant of EUR 267,000 and additional project funding from the Ministry of Education and Culture and the European Union. TENK also served as the treasurer of the ENRIO association.

\*\*\*

This annual report has been approved at the meeting of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK held on 13 February 2023.

*Riitta Keiski*  
Chair

*Sanna-Kaisa Spoof*  
Secretary General

# APPENDIX 1

## TEACHING, PRESENTATIONS AND REQUESTED SPEECHES RELATED TO RESEARCH INTEGRITY

### CHAIR RIITTA KEISKI

- Course: Research Ethics (477321S), University of Oulu, Faculty of Technology (5 cr), 1 February – 19 April 2020
- Lecture: Field-specific ethical questions – the ethics and environmental ethics of technology (3 hrs) for postgraduate course Scientific research and ethics (920002J), University of Oulu Graduate School, University of Oulu, 6 April 2020
- Lecture: Technology, Natural Sciences & Environment (3 hrs), for postgraduate course Scientific Research and Ethics (920002J), University of Oulu Graduate School, University of Oulu, 11 November 2020
- Opening words from the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK, ENRIO General Meeting, Restaurant Töölö, Helsinki, 28 April 2022

### MEMBER VEIKKO IKONEN

- VTT's research integrity and occupational safety workshops (12 total), June–December 2022
- VTT's clinics on research integrity and responsible research and innovation, Oulu 3 November 2022 and Jyväskylä 4 November 2022
- VTT webinar Ethics in Horizon Europe proposals, 12 October 2022
- “Empowering design as part of a responsible approach to design”, Sociologist Days 2022
- “Empowerment, Ethics and Responsibility in Design”, Ethics By Design: Responsible Development Of Technology. Conference organised by The Łukasiewicz Research Network – Institute of Organisation and Management in Industry “ORGMASZ”, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Warsaw, Warsaw 23 June 2022
- “Opinion on cybersecurity”, Digital Ethics for Europe, LAAS, Toulouse, France, 20 June 2022
- “Responsibility by Design: Actionable strategies and a tool for leveraging technology ethically and enabling innovation responsibly”, Ethicomp 2022, Turku 26–28 July 2022
- Responsible Research and Innovation. CÁTEDRA EUROPA 2022, Barranquilla, Colombia, 19 November 2022



## MEMBER ALEKSI TORNIO

- “Responsible Conduct of Research and Prevention of Research Misconduct”, Supervisor training. Part II: Ethical Considerations in Supervision, University of Turku and Åbo Akademi, Turku 16 February 2022

## PERMANENT EXPERT KRISTA VARANTOLA

- Presentation on the ALLEA code and its relationship with sectoral code sets, meeting for EU project Hybridia, Copenhagen 6/2022
- Presentation on the update of the ALLEA code, ENRIO meeting, Barcelona 10/2022
- Expert and commentator at the remote meetings and in-person meeting of the advisory group for the PRO\_ETHICS-EU project, Brussels 11/2022
- Preliminary examiner for a doctoral dissertation on research integrity, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam
- Expert and commentator in the process of drafting an ethical code at the Technische Universität, Vienna

## SECRETARY GENERAL SANNA-KAISA SPOOF

- “Research integrity for genealogists”, theme Saturday of the Genealogical Society of Finland 23 April 2022
- “Gaining credibility to support and promote responsible research with different people from different backgrounds and countries: A Short History of ENRIO”, 7<sup>th</sup> World Conference on Research Integrity, Cape Town, South Africa 1 June 2022
- “Risks for Research during Global Crises. Voice of Research Integrity Offices and Committees”, PREPARED Kick off Meeting, Bonn 29 September 2022
- “How can you recognise actual information?”, panellist, The many forms of research data, Finnish Association for Scholarly Publishing & HAMK, Hämeenlinna 1 September 2022
- “The Guideline on good scientific practice is a researcher’s support and safety”, Addresses on responsible science, Tieteessä tapahtuu 4/2022
- “Responsible conduct of research and non-fiction. Recommendations of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK”, Tietokirjakahvila by the Committee for Public Information, Helsinki 23 November 2022

## EXPERT EERO KAILA

- “Responsible conduct of research in Finland: from authorship issues to research misconduct degrees”, Langnet, Turku 16 August 2022
- “The Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity (The updated RCR guidelines)”, Folkhälsan, Helsinki 14 September 2022
- “Ethical review in natural and environmental sciences: work in progress in Finland” (with Veera Launis) & “Responsible conduct of research: Finnish cases & progress report on new guidelines”, Oslo 10 October 2022

- “Finnish National Board on Research Integrity and the Update of RCR Guidelines”, Archaeologist Days, Helsinki 18 November 2022

## **COORDINATOR ANNI SAIRIO**

- Presentation, ENRIO’s online publication *Research Integrity Practice in Europe*, ENRIO meeting, Helsinki 29 April 2022
- Presentation on RCR guidelines, Responsible open learning workshop organised by the Open Science Coordination: the reliability of content and research integrity, online event, 2 May 2022
- Presentation on the Research Integrity Barometer survey and the Research Integrity Adviser system at the The National Research Ethics Committees, Oslo 11 October 2022
- Presentation, ENRIO’s online publication *Research Integrity Practice in Europe*, Barcelona 20 October 2022

## **INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS COORDINATOR KALLE VIDENOJA**

- “International actors of research integrity – from local standards to shared principles”, training event for RDI personnel by the ethics committee of the Helsinki Metropolitan area Universities of Applied Sciences, online event, 17 May 2022
- “The national system of research integrity development and monitoring in Finland: 30 years of self-regulation”, hearing of the Lithuanian Parliament, online event, 7 October 2022
- “Horizon Europe project PREPARED: developing a framework for research ethics and integrity in global crisis, Q&A”, The Norwegian National Research Ethics Committees, Oslo 10 October 2022
- “The Horizon Europe project PREPARED”, ENRIO’s autumn meeting, Barcelona 21 October 2022

# APPENDIX 2

## PUBLICATIONS RELATED TO RESEARCH INTEGRITY, INTERVIEWS GIVEN BY TENK REPRESENTATIVES AND OTHER MEDIA PRESENCE RELATED TO RESEARCH INTEGRITY

### VICE CHAIR SIRPA THESSLER

- Interview on the Open Science website on 26 October 2022, <https://avointiede.fi/en/news/natural-and-environmental-scientific-research-open-ethical-review>

### MEMBER VEIKKO IKONEN

- Ikonen V., Yaghmaei e., Miettinen J., Sanchez Nieminen G. Responsibility by Design: Actionable strategies and a tool for leveraging technology ethically and enabling innovation responsibly (2022). Proceedings of the ETHICOMP 2022. University of Turku, Turku, Finland pp. 278–292. <https://sites.utu.fi/ethicomp2022/proceeding/>

### MEMBER SUSANNA NÄREAHO

- Näreaho, Susanna; Latvanen, Jaana; Päällysaho, Seliina: Principles of open RDI: A guide for actors in universities of applied sciences. Publications of Metropolia University of Applied Sciences, OIVA series 51, Helsinki 2022. <https://www.metropolia.fi/fi/tutkimus-kehitys-ja-innovaatiot/julkaisut/avoimuuden-perusteet>

### SECRETARY GENERAL SANNA-KAISA SPOOF

- Interview, Tylkkäri 1/2022
- Interview, Jylkkäri 3/2022
- Interview, Lääkärilehti 4 November 2022
- Interview, YLE.fi 4 November 2022
- Interview, YLE.fi 16 November 2022
- Interview, Acatiimi 5/2022
- Interview, Helsingin Sanomat 10 November 2022
- Interview, Teemasuomalainen Tiede, several regional newspapers, e.g. Etelä-Suomen Sanomat 5 October 2022
- Interview, Keski-Uusimaa and other regional newspapers 21 November 2022
- Interview, Hammaslääkärilehti 2022

# APPENDIX 3

## CHAIRMANSHIPS AND MEMBERSHIPS OF ETHICS COMMITTEES AND SIMILAR BODIES

### CHAIR RIITTA KEISKI

- Ethics working group, University of Oulu, 2019–2021, 2022–2024, Member
- I4FUTURE Doctoral Programme, Ethics Committee, Chair, 2017–2022, University of Oulu (Horizon-MSCA-COFUND-DP I4Future, EC Grant Agreement No 713606)
- I4WORLD Doctoral programme, Ethics Committee, Chair, 2022–2026, University of Oulu (Horizon-MSCA-2021-COFUND-DP I4WORLD, 101081280)
- AGEMERA project, Ethics Advisor, 2022-2025 (Horizon Europe, Horizon-CL4-2021-RESILIENCE-01-06, 101058178)

### MEMBER VEIKKO IKONEN

- Human sciences ethics committee in the Tampere region, Member
- VTT's ethics committee, Member
- Ethical guidelines for the Global South related research and partnerships, Steering Group, Member
- Horizon 2020 funded Vogas project, ethics board, Chair
- Horizon 2020 funded A-Patch project, ethics advisory committee, Chair

### MEMBER MATTI KARHUNEN

- VTT's ethics committee, Chair

### MEMBER JARI LAURIKKA

- Regional medical research ethics committee in the Tays catchment area, Deputy Member

### MEMBER SUSANNA NÄREAHO

- Human sciences ethics committee of the Helsinki Metropolitan Area Universities of Applied Sciences, Chair

### MEMBER RIITTA SALMELIN

- Aalto University Research Ethics Committee, Member
- Nordic Committee on Bioethics, Member

## **MEMBER ALEKSI TORNIO**

- National Committee on Medical Research Ethics TUKIJA, Member (Vice Chair since 8 July 2022)

## **PERMANENT EXPERT KRISTA VARANTOLA**

- Permanent working group on science and ethics PWGSE at All European Academies ALLEA, update working group for the ALLEA code, Chair

## **SECRETARY GENERAL SANNA-KAISA SPOOF**

- European Network of Research Integrity Offices ENRIO, Chair until 29 April 2022
- European Network of Research Integrity Offices (ENRIO) Association vzw, President until 29 April 2022; Past President
- Council of Europe Platform on Ethics, Transparency and Integrity in Education (ETINED), Member
- Horizon 2020 funded Pro-Ethics project, Advisory Board, Member
- Horizon 2020 funded Path2Integrity project, Policymaker and stakeholder board, Member
- Advisory committee on the ethical code for Sámi research, Member

# APPENDIX 4

## ETHICS DAY 2022: INTERNATIONAL DIMENSIONS OF RESEARCH INTEGRITY

### ONLINE EVENT 15 MARCH 2022

#### Programme

- 11:00**      **WORKSHOP 1: THE ETHICS OF APPLYING FOR FUNDING**  
A workshop on the ethical aspects related to complementary funding in the European context. Led by Senior Specialist **Raija Oikari** from research and innovation services at the University of Jyväskylä. Read a more detailed description of the workshop below.
- 11:00**      **WORKSHOP 2: WORKSHOP 2: UPDATED RCR GUIDELINE – WAYS TO PROMOTE ADOPTION**  
A workshop on the ways of promoting the adoption of the new RCR guideline by the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK. Participants and TENK will be able to use the results of the workshop when the guideline is being distributed. Led by TENK experts **Minna Aittasalo** and **Eero Kaila**. Read a more detailed description of the workshop below.
- 12:00**      **LUNCH BREAK**
- 13:00**      **ETHICS DAY LAUNCH**  
Welcoming address. Chair of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK, Professor **Riitta Keiski**, University of Oulu  
  
Significance of ethically high-quality research in solving global challenges. European Commissioner **Jutta Urpilainen**, European Commission
- 13:15**      **SESSION I: RESEARCH INTEGRITY IN A GLOBAL WORLD**  
*Discussion moderated by Professor of Social Ethics*  
**Jaana Hallamaa**, University of Helsinki.  
  
Why do we need ethical guidelines for research and cooperation in the *global south*? Director **Johanna Kivimäki**, UniPID – Finnish University Partnership for International Development Coordination Unit

Science, freedom and human rights – activities of the Human Rights Committee of the Council of Finnish Academies.

Professor **Liisa Laakso**, The Nordic Africa Institute

AI ethics – What should researchers know about the UNESCO recommendation? Director **Päivi Tikka**, Strategic Research, Academy of Finland

*Audience questions and discussion*

14:15

#### COFFEE BREAK

14:30

#### ETHICS DAY INFO

International actors of research integrity – from local standards to shared principles. Coordinator **Kalle Videnoja**, Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK

Legislative amendments: new authorisation procedure for medicinal product trials and a public website. Senior Officer **Marko Ahteensuu**, National Committee on Medical Research Ethics (Tukija)

14:50

#### SESSION II: INTERNATIONAL TRENDS AND UNEXPECTED DEVELOPMENTS

*Discussion moderated by Emeritus Professor **Markku Leskelä**, Chair of the board of the Council of Finnish Academies.*

When research doesn't go as planned.

Professor **Erika Löfström**, University of Helsinki

COVID-19 vaccines' fast track to widespread use: ethical questions. Director General of RDI **Terhi Kilpi**, Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare (THL)

Research integrity from a European perspective. Chancellor Emerita **Krista Varantola**, University of Tampere

*Audience questions and discussion*

16:00

#### ETHICS DAY WRAP-UP

#### ETHICS DAY IS ORGANISED IN COOPERATION BY THE NATIONAL ETHICS COMMITTEES:

- [Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK](#)
- [Board for Gene Technology GTLK](#)
- [The Council of Finnish Academies](#)
- [National Advisory Board on Social Welfare and Health Care Ethics ETENE](#)
- [National Committee on Medical Research Ethics Tukija](#)
- [Council on the protection of animals used for scientific or educational purposes TOKES](#)



TUTKIMUSEETTINEN  
NEUVOTTELUKUNTA

FORSKNINGSETISKA  
DELEGATIONEN

FINNISH NATIONAL BOARD ON  
RESEARCH INTEGRITY TENK

[www.tenk.fi](http://www.tenk.fi)