





## **5. Authorship Issues**

- a. Have you added all authors, and only all authors, to the byline of your paper (or chapters of your dissertation) in accordance with Vancouver Recommendations? Why/why not?
  
- b. Give a short description of the contribution of each author and why it qualifies to authorship.
  
- c. Are there scholars you have considered adding to your byline, but have not added? Why?
  
- d. Do you acknowledge scholars who have contributed to your paper/thesis, but who do not qualify as authors? What were their contribution? Did you ask for their permission?

## **6. Conflicts of interest**

- a. Declare your conflicts of interest in regards to your paper/thesis, if any.
  
- b. Describe your considerations about any conflicts of interest you ended up not declaring above.
  
- c. Often journals require you to declare your conflicts of interest. Have you considered declaring them in your PhD thesis, e.g. in the foreword? Why/why not?

## 7. (Ethical) Permissions

- a. Which of the following institutions have given permission to the project your study is part of? Explain why.
  - Regional/National Committee on Health Research Ethics
  - Danish Medicines Agency
  - Danish Patient Safety Authority
  - The Danish Working Environment Authority
  - The Animal Experiments Inspectorate
  - Faculty Secretariat, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Copenhagen
  - Research Ethics Committee of Science and Health, University of Copenhagen
  
- b. How do you plan to document the permissions required for and granted to the project your study is part of in your paper or in your thesis? You may look at the journals webpage for advise.

## 8. Data Management

- a. Did you make a data management plan in the first year of your PhD? If no, why not?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- b. What is your primary material? Where is it stored now? Where and how do you aim to store it in the future?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- c. What are your data? Where are your data stored now? Where and how do you aim to store them in the future?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- d. Do you work with personal data? Have they been anonymized? Where did you store the informed consents?

- e. Do you intent to, and are you required to, share your data at the end of your project? If so, where will you share them?
  
- f. Do you consider using your primary material and data in other projects after your PhD project? If so, what makes you believe you have a right to use it?

### **9. Other issues**

- a. Did you consider and have you talked to your supervisor and other partners about your work responsibilities in regards to publication of (further) articles after your PhD project? (For example if you receive an 'accepted with minor revision' feedback from a journal you submitted a paper to while you were still a PhD student. Who shall revise and re-submit the paper?)
  
- b. What have you done or will do to make sure your English is correct (linguistically fluent etc.) in your paper/PhD thesis?
  
- c. Do you consider your thesis/paper to be a piece of responsibly conducted research?

### **Assessment**

The assignment will be assessed by teachers from the course within two weeks after the assignment deadline (the month of July is exempted). Assignments will be marked in Absalon by the assessor as either 'Complete' (√) or 'Incomplete'(X). It is your responsibility to check in Absalon whether you need to re-submit.

### **Non-satisfactory assignment**

If the assignment is marked 'Incomplete', you will receive written comments (in Absalon) on how to improve the assignment. Within two weeks hereafter, you must submit a revised assignment to Absalon and inform the relevant teacher of the resubmission, including information on which course you attended.

You have three attempts to pass the assignment. If the assignment is not passed after three attempts, you must take the RCR2 course again. Failure to meet a deadline results in a failed attempt.

To ensure a fair assessment, all non-satisfactory assignments will be evaluated by two teachers. The assignment and the course are governed by the PhD rules and regulations at SUND.

### **Confidentiality**

Assignments are confidential for all other than the assessors and the course directors and course organisers<sup>1</sup>. When all assignments have been graded, they will be deleted from Absalon.

### **Questions**

Questions about the assignment must be directed to the course lecturer.

For any other questions about the RCR2 course, please contact the course administration (FAK-PHDkursus@sund.ku.dk), Graduate School of Health and Medical Sciences.

---

<sup>1</sup> If a PhD student files a complaint of the assessment, other staff may also read the assignment to be able to assess the complaint. If an alleged case of scientific misconduct is described in the assignment, the assessors and the course directors may forward the assignment to the university management, after consultation with the PhD student.