

Regulations for safeguarding good research practice and dealing with research misconduct at Saarland University

18 October 2023

Note: This translation is provided for information purposes only. In the event of any discrepancy between the translation and the original German version published in the Official Bulletin (*Dienstblatt der Hochschulen des Saarlandes*), the provisions of the latter shall take precedence.

Pursuant to Section 24(1), item 1 of the Saarland Higher Education Institutions Act (SHSG) (Official Gazette I, p. 1080) of 30 November 2016 most recently amended in law by the Act of 16/17 June 2021 (Official Gazette I, p. 1762), the Senate of Saarland University hereby issues the following regulations for safeguarding good research practice and dealing with research misconduct at Saarland University:

Contents

Part 1

Purpose and scope

Section 1 Purpose

Section 2 Scope

Part 2

Principles of good research practice at Saarland University

Section 3 Organizational responsibility

Section 4 Principles of good research practice

Section 5 Publication, authorship and responsibility

Section 6 Early career researchers

Section 7 Research

Section 8 Performance assessment

Section 9 Confidentiality and neutrality of review processes and discussions

Part 3

Research misconduct

Section 10 Research misconduct

Part 4

Ombudsperson, Board for Safeguarding Good Research Practice, responsibilities

Section 11 Ombudsperson

Section 12 Board for Safeguarding Good Research Practice

Section 13 Procedure in cases managed wholly or in part by other bodies

Part 5

Procedure in cases of alleged research misconduct

Section 14 Procedural principles

Section 15 Initial investigation where there are reasonable grounds to suspect research misconduct

Section 16 Formal investigation

Section 17 Further procedure

Part 6

Final provision

Section 18 Commencement

Part 1 Purpose and scope

Section 1 Purpose

(1) Saarland University is responsible for the organization of research, teaching and support for early career researchers within the framework of its legal mandate (cf. Sections 3(1) and (2) of the Saarland Higher Education Institutions Act (SHSG). Saarland University has formulated these regulations in order to provide a framework for good research practice and to implement appropriate measures for preventing and dealing with cases of research misconduct. The regulations respect academic freedom (Art. 5(3) of the Basic Law (*Grundgesetz*)) and take into account the Code of Conduct of the German Research Foundation (DFG) as set out in its recommended 'Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice' in the revised version of 3 July 2019.

(2) In fulfilling its responsibility for the organization of research, teaching and support for early career researchers, the university must ensure that academic and research progress can evolve in an atmosphere of openness, creativity and motivation. However, within the relevant statutory framework, the university must also implement adequate measures to prevent and deal with cases of research misconduct.

Section 2 Scope

The following regulations are designed to help define good research practice at the university, to prevent research misconduct and, in cases of suspected misconduct, to enable a fair (internal) procedure for members and staff of the university, including doctoral students and (academic) researchers undertaking their habilitation, which protects the interests of those involved and affected as well as the reputation of the university and its institutions. Statutory procedures and labour law procedures shall remain unaffected by these regulations.

Part 2 Principles of good research practice at Saarland University

Section 3 Organizational responsibility

(1) Saarland University and the heads of the individual research work units at the university shall guarantee that their academics have appropriate framework conditions for academic work and ensure that they are able to comply with the relevant legal and ethical standards at all times.

(2) The heads of the research work units are responsible for their entire unit and organize the cooperation of their members in such a way that they can fulfil their tasks as a group, the necessary collaboration and coordination take place and all members are aware of their roles, rights and obligations.

(3) In order to prevent research misconduct, the university is responsible for communicating good research practice to its members and staff. The faculties of Saarland University are called upon to ensure that the principles of research work and good research practice are emphasized and taught to students from the start of their studies. In view of the rapid rate of research development in some disciplines, awareness should also be raised of the possibility of research misconduct.

Section 4

Principles of good research practice

(1) General principles of research work are in particular:

1. working in accordance with recognized academic standards
2. documenting results
3. rigorously questioning all findings
4. maintaining strict honesty with regard to the contributions of partners, competitors and predecessors and identifying the origin of data.

(2) Researchers shall in accordance with the standards of the relevant subject area use adequate means to back up research data and results made publicly available as well as the central materials on which they are based and the research software used. The university shall ensure that the necessary infrastructure for archiving is provided. Primary data that serves as the basis of academic publications shall be adequately stored for ten years at the originating institution (laboratory, university or hospital department). Researchers shall provide reasonable grounds if particular data is not archived.

(3) Every member of the university is responsible for ensuring that these principles are observed by themselves and all subordinate employees. In particular, these principles shall form an integral part of the teaching and training of early career researchers, who should be taught not only theoretical knowledge and technical skills, but also the fundamental ethical tenets of academic research. The principles of good research practice shall be taught as early as possible in academic teaching and research training. Researchers at all career levels shall regularly update their knowledge of the standards of good research practice and the current state of research in their field.

(4) Without prejudice to the responsibility of university management, each university institution is responsible for establishing appropriate organizational structures that ensure that the tasks of leadership, supervision, quality assurance and conflict management are clearly allocated, carried out and communicated to members and affiliated members.

(5) With regard to staff recruitment and development, due consideration shall be given to gender equality and diversity. The relevant processes shall be transparent and avoid unconscious bias as much as possible.

(6) Suitable structures and policies shall be established for the supervision of early career researchers. Honest and fair career advice, training opportunities and mentoring shall be offered to researchers and research support staff. The leadership role includes ensuring adequate individual supervision of early career researchers that is integrated into the overall institutional policy, as well as career development for researchers and research support staff.

(7) Appropriate organizational measures shall be in place at the level of the individual research unit and at institutional management level to prevent the abuse of power and exploitation of dependent relationships.

Section 5

Publication, authorship and responsibility

(1) Researchers are obliged to be accountable to society for their work, in particular by ensuring truthfulness, completeness, transparency, methodological honesty and verifiability.

(2) As a rule, researchers shall make all results available as part of scientific/academic discourse. In specific cases, however, there may be reasons not to make results publicly available; this decision must not depend on third parties.

(3) If results are made available in the public domain, researchers shall describe them clearly and in full. Whenever possible, researchers shall make the research data, materials and information on which the results are based, as well as the methods and software used, available in recognized archives and repositories in accordance with the FAIR principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Re-Usable). Self-programmed software should be made publicly available with the source code. Restrictions may arise with regard to public accessibility, for example in the context of copyrights or patent applications.

(4) Publications should also meet the following criteria:

1. Publication of new observations or findings in original works
2. Consideration and identification of relevant preliminary work by other authors
3. Compliance with subject-specific standards
4. Presentation of the quality assurance mechanisms used
5. Identification of the origin of data, organisms, materials and software used in the research process and evidence of subsequent use of data
6. Enabling the replication of published studies as an essential part of quality assurance through sufficiently detailed description of materials and methods
7. Ensuring the persistence, citability and documentation of the source code of publicly accessible software
8. Citing the original sources
9. Description of the type and scope of research data generated in the research process
10. Correction or retraction of publications in the event of discrepancies or errors subsequently discovered. The researchers shall work with the relevant publisher or infrastructure provider etc. as quickly as possible to ensure that the correction or retraction is made and identified accordingly.

(5) In line with the principle of 'quality over quantity', researchers shall avoid splitting research into inappropriately small publications and limit self-citations to a minimum.

(6) Authorship is justified by significant contributions such as conceptual design, data collection, evaluation, processing of data and conversion into a publishable manuscript. An author is someone who has made a genuine, identifiable contribution to the content of published research, data or software. What constitutes a genuine and identifiable contribution must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and depends on the subject area in question. If a contribution is not sufficient to justify authorship, the individual's support may be properly acknowledged in footnotes or a foreword or credited in an acknowledgement.

(7) Honorary authorship where no genuine and identifiable contribution was made is not permissible. A leadership or supervisory function does not itself constitute co-authorship.

(8) Collaborating researchers shall agree on authorship of a publication. The decision as to the order in which authors are named shall be made in good time, normally no later than when the manuscript is drafted, and in accordance with clear criteria that reflect the practices within the relevant subject areas.

(9) Authorship means shared responsibility for the entire manuscript. All authors shall agree on the final version of the work to be published. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, they share responsibility for the publication. Researchers may not refuse to give their consent to publication of the results without sufficient grounds. Refusal of consent must be justified with verifiable criticism of data, methods or results.

(10) Authors shall select the publication medium carefully, with due regard for its quality and visibility in the relevant field of discourse. In addition to publication in books and journals, authors may also consider alternative publication media. All publication media shall be assessed in advance to ensure their seriousness. Researchers who assume the role of editor shall carefully select the publications for which they perform editorial duties. The

scientific/academic quality of the research work does not depend on the medium in which it is published.

Section 6 Early career researchers

(1) Special attention shall be paid to training and support for early career researchers. The university is responsible for communicating good research practice to its members and staff, in particular to early career researchers.

(2) Suitable supervisory structures and policies shall be established for early career researchers. Experienced and early career researchers shall support each other in a process of continuous mutual learning and ongoing training and maintain a regular dialogue.

(3) Doctoral students and other early career researchers should be supervised by at least two experienced researchers, one of whom should not belong to the same research group or department as the early career researcher. The supervising researchers should be available for advice and assistance and, if necessary, for mediation in conflict situations. Honest and fair career advice, training opportunities and mentoring shall be offered to researchers and research support staff.

Section 7 Research

(1) The roles and responsibilities of the researchers and research support staff participating in a research project must be clear at each stage of the project. The participants in a research project shall engage in regular dialogue. They shall define their roles and responsibilities in a suitable way and adapt them where necessary.

(2) Researchers shall take into account and acknowledge the current state of research when planning a project. To identify relevant and suitable research questions, they shall familiarize themselves with existing research in the public domain. Methods to avoid (unconscious) bias, e.g. the use of blinding in experiments, shall be used where possible. Researchers shall examine whether and to what extent gender and diversity may be of significance to the research project. Saarland University shall provide an appropriate policy framework for this approach.

(3) The university is responsible for ensuring that the actions of its members and affiliated members comply with regulations regarding good research practice and shall establish suitable organizational structures to this end, without prejudice to the personal responsibility of the individual members and affiliated members. Its researchers shall adopt a responsible approach to the constitutionally guaranteed right to academic freedom. They shall take account of applicable rights and obligations, particularly those arising from legal requirements and contracts with third parties, and where necessary shall seek the relevant permits, licences and ethics approval and present these when required. With regard to research projects, the potential consequences of the research should be evaluated in detail and the ethical aspects assessed. Researchers can approach the relevant contact persons and committees/boards for this purpose, e.g. the Committee for the Ethics of Security-Relevant Research at Saarland University.

(4) The legal framework of a research project shall include documented agreements on usage rights relating to the data and results generated by the project, particularly the usage rights of those researchers who independently and autonomously collected or produced the data or results. During a research project, those entitled to use the data shall decide whether third parties should have access to that data (subject to data protection regulations).

(5) When conducting research, researchers shall use scientifically sound and appropriate methods and make their research results available to third parties in an accessible and verifiable manner according to their subject area. The methods selected to answer research questions shall be chosen appropriately. When developing and applying new methods, particular importance shall be placed on quality assurance and the establishment of standards.

(6) Researchers shall document all information relevant to the research process and present it in such a way that the research results can be reviewed and assessed. Individual results that do not support the research hypothesis shall also be documented. The selection or manipulation of results and documentation must be avoided. Where subject-specific recommendations exist for review and assessment, researchers shall create documentation in accordance with these guidelines. If the documentation does not satisfy these requirements, the constraints and reasoning shall be clearly stated. Documentation and research results shall not be manipulated; they shall be protected as effectively as possible against manipulation.

Section 8 Performance assessment

To assess the performance of researchers, a multidimensional approach is called for: in addition to academic and scientific achievements, other aspects may be taken into consideration. Performance shall be assessed primarily on the basis of qualitative measures, while quantitative indicators may be incorporated into the overall assessment only with appropriate differentiation and reflection. The provisions of the Germany's General Anti-Discrimination Act (Allgemeines Gleichbehandlungsgesetz – AGG) apply. Where provided voluntarily, individual circumstances stated in curricula vitae may be taken into account when assessing performance.

Section 9 Confidentiality and neutrality of review processes and discussions

Fair and honest conduct is the basis for the legitimacy of any judgement-forming process. Researchers who evaluate submitted manuscripts, funding proposals or personal qualifications are obliged to maintain strict confidentiality with regard to this process. They shall disclose all facts that could give rise to the appearance of bias or a conflict of interest. The duty to maintain confidentiality and to disclose facts that could give rise to the appearance of bias or a conflict of interest also applies to members of research advisory and decision-making bodies. The confidentiality of third-party material to which a reviewer or committee member gains access precludes its disclosure to others or its application for personal use.

Part 3 Rules on preventing and dealing with research misconduct at Saarland University

Section 10 Research misconduct

(1) Research misconduct shall be deemed to have occurred if, in a research-relevant context, misrepresentations are made intentionally or through gross negligence, the intellectual property of others is infringed or their research activities are otherwise impeded. The circumstances of each individual case are to be given proper consideration. Serious misconduct includes in particular:

1. Misrepresentation
 - b. by fabricating data and/or research results

- c. by falsifying data and/or research results (e.g. by suppressing and/or omitting data and/or results obtained in the research process without disclosing this, or by manipulating a representation or illustration/figure
 - d. through discrepancies between visual representations (graphic and film) and corresponding statements
 - e. providing incorrect information in an application letter, a grant proposal or in required progress reports (including false statements about the publication medium and publications in print).
2. Infringement of intellectual property in relation to a copyrighted work created by another person or significant research findings, hypotheses, theories or research approaches originating from others:
 - a. by using others' content without giving proper credit to the original source or using others' content without authorization and claiming authorship (plagiarism)
 - b. by exploiting others' research approaches and ideas, in particular as a reviewer or supervisor (theft of ideas)
 - c. by sharing, without authorization, others' data, theories and findings
 - d. by claiming, or assuming without justification, authorship or co-authorship, in particular if no genuine, identifiable contribution was made to the research content of the publication
 - e. by falsifying content
 - f. by publishing an unpublished work, finding, hypothesis, theory or research approach, or otherwise making it available to third parties, without authorization.
 3. Claiming another person's (co-)authorship without consent
 4. Sabotaging research activities (such as damaging, destroying or manipulating experimental set-ups, instrumentation, documentation, hardware, software, chemicals or other items required by others to conduct an experiment)
 5. Falsifying or omitting research data and research documents (primary data) in violation of statutory provisions or recognized principles of research work in the respective discipline
 6. Falsifying or omitting research data documentation
 7. Making false or malicious allegations:
 - (2) The complainant must have objective reasons for suspecting that an infringement of the standards of good research practice may have occurred.
 - (3) Joint responsibility for misconduct may arise from
 1. intentional participation (in the form of instigation or abetment) in the intentional misconduct of others
 2. Knowledge of misrepresentation by others
 3. Co-authorship of falsified publications
 4. Gross neglect of supervisory duties.

Part 4

Ombudsperson, Board for Safeguarding Good Research Practice, responsibilities

Section 11 Ombudsperson

- (1) The University President, with the approval of the Senate, shall appoint an independent university ombudsperson for a term of three years, as well as a deputy ombudsperson who shall act should the ombudsperson be unable to carry out their duties or should there be concern about a conflict of interest, to whom the university's members and affiliated members can turn with questions relating to good research practice and in cases of suspected

misconduct. The ombudsperson may be re-appointed once. The ombudsperson may not be a member of a central governing body of the university while exercising their office.

(2) At their own initiative, the ombudsperson shall act on any relevant information they receive regarding research misconduct and shall examine whether the allegations are specific and significant enough to be plausible and whether the allegations can be resolved, maintaining strict confidentiality throughout the proceedings. The ombudsperson shall advise persons who, through no fault of their own, have been involved in cases of research misconduct in order to safeguard their personal and research integrity.

(3) The university shall ensure that the ombudsperson is adequately known at the institution. Academic staff at the university have the right to speak to the ombudsperson in person within a short period of time. The work of the ombudsperson shall be recognized and accepted and the ombudsperson shall receive the necessary content-related and administrative support from the university, which shall include the provision of an Ombuds Office. Once a year, the ombudsperson and the deputy ombudsperson shall report to the University President on the activities of the ombudspersons and the Ombuds Office in the past calendar year in anonymized form.

(4) Members and affiliated members can contact the ombudsperson of Saarland University or the national German Research Ombudsman (Ombudsman für die Wissenschaft). The German Research Ombudsman is an independent body that provides advice and support on issues relating to good research practice and allegations of inappropriate conduct.

Section 12 Board for Safeguarding Good Research Practice

A permanent Board for Safeguarding Good Research Practice exists to investigate allegations of research misconduct. The Board consists of three members and three deputy members who are appointed by the University President with the approval of the Senate for a term of three years. The members of the Board may be re-appointed once. The Board elects a chairperson from among its members and decides by majority vote. The ombudsperson and their deputy are members of the Board as guests in an advisory capacity. The university ensures that the Board members are adequately known at the institution. The work of the Board shall be recognized and accepted and the Board shall receive the necessary content-related and administrative support from the university, which shall include the provision of a dedicated support office.

Section 13 Procedure in cases managed wholly or in part by other bodies

(1) If the allegation of research misconduct relates to an examination procedure or a degree thesis in an undergraduate or postgraduate degree programme, the investigation shall be conducted by the responsible faculty or examination board.

(2) If the allegation of research misconduct relates to a doctoral or habilitation procedure, the Board shall first assess whether there is an initial suspicion of research misconduct as part of the initial investigation in accordance with Section 15. The Board shall forward the outcome of this investigation to the faculty. The faculty shall conduct the doctoral or habilitation procedure or the procedure for revoking a degree with the mandatory involvement of the ombudsperson in accordance with the relevant regulations, in particular the doctoral degree regulations or habilitation regulations. After completion of this procedure, the faculty shall inform the Board of the final outcome, including its reasoning, and in the case of legal proceedings, including any legally binding court decisions. The Board shall then decide whether a formal investigation procedure should be instigated in accordance with Section 16.

(3) Paragraphs 1 and 2 above shall not apply if, in connection with an examination, doctoral degree procedure or habilitation procedure or a degree thesis, there is suspicion of research misconduct by a supervisor or advisor.

Part 5 Procedure in cases of alleged research misconduct

Section 14 Procedural principles

(1) With respect to the imposition of employment sanctions, disciplinary law applying to civil servants shall take legal precedence over the following procedure. Additionally, other statutory provisions, e.g. those relating to employment law, cannot be rendered invalid by the following procedure. The initial investigation and formal procedure must therefore be terminated immediately and the University President notified accordingly as soon as there is sufficient suspicion of misconduct relevant to civil-service disciplinary law or sufficient suspicion that obligations under the employment contract have been breached.

(2) The investigation of allegations of research misconduct shall be carried out in strict confidentiality and adhere to the presumption of innocence. The university shall ensure that the entire procedure (initial investigation and, if applicable, formal investigation) is carried out as promptly as possible and shall implement the steps necessary to complete each stage of the procedure within an appropriate time frame.

Section 15 Initial investigation where there are reasonable grounds to suspect research misconduct

(1) As a rule, the ombudsperson shall be informed immediately where there are reasonable grounds to suspect research misconduct. The information should be provided in writing. If information is provided orally, a written record must be made of the suspicion and the supporting documents.

(2) The ombudsperson shall report any allegation of research misconduct to the Board in strict confidentiality to protect the complainant and the respondent. An anonymous disclosure of information will also be examined in an investigation, provided that the anonymous complainant presents solid and sufficiently concrete facts. At this stage of the investigation, the name of the complainant will not be disclosed to the respondent without their consent. The disclosure of information by the complainant should not disadvantage the research or professional career prospects of either the complainant or the respondent. Directly after the Board has been informed of the allegation of research misconduct, it will assess the possible existence of conflicts of interest among the members of the Board on the basis of Article 9 of the Fundamental Principles and Rules Governing Saarland University (Grundordnung der Universität des Saarlandes) and relevant recommendations (DFG form 'Guidelines for Avoiding Conflicts of Interest'). If there is a potential conflict of interest regarding a member of the Board, this member may not participate in the further proceedings either in an advisory or a decision-making role.

(3) The respondent and the complainant shall be given the opportunity to be heard at each stage of the process. The Board shall give the respondent the opportunity to make representations without delay and provide details of the incriminating facts and evidence. Paragraph 1, sentence 2 shall apply accordingly. The deadline for submitting representations is two weeks. It may be extended depending on the circumstances of the individual case. At this stage of the investigation, the name of the complainant will not be disclosed to the

respondent without their consent. The Board may obtain opinions from experts at any stage of the investigation.

(4) Upon receipt of representations from the respondent or expiry of the deadline, the Board shall decide, normally within two weeks, whether the initial investigation is to be terminated because the suspicion has not been sufficiently substantiated or the alleged misconduct has been fully resolved, or whether a formal investigation is to be initiated. The respondent and the complainant shall be notified of the reasons for the Board's decision.

(5) The outcome of the initial investigation will be communicated to the research organizations concerned and, where applicable, any third parties with a legitimate interest in the decision.

(6) If the complainant does not agree with the termination of the investigation, they have the right to appeal within two weeks to the Board, which will then review its decision.

Section 16 Formal investigation

(1) The opening of the formal investigation procedure shall be communicated to the University President by the Chair of the Board.

(2) The Board may, at its discretion, consult with subject-matter specialists as well as other experts with experience in such cases, who will support the Board in an advisory capacity. These may include arbitration advisors.

(3) The Board shall conduct an oral hearing that is not open to the public and shall appraise itself of the evidence to determine whether or not research misconduct has been committed. The researcher accused of misconduct (the 'respondent') shall be given suitable opportunity to make representations to the Board. They may request an oral hearing and seek assistance from a person they trust. This also applies to other persons to be heard by the Board.

(4) It may be necessary to disclose the name of the complainant if the respondent would otherwise be unable to properly defend themselves, for example because there may be a need to examine the credibility and motives of the complainant with regard to the allegation of possible misconduct.

(5) The proceedings by the Board shall end

1. if it considers that misconduct has not been proven and decides to close the investigation or
2. if it considers misconduct to be proven and decides to report the matter to the University President. The report shall describe the specific misconduct with details of the evidence and shall, depending on the severity of the research misconduct, make recommendations to the University President regarding the type and scope of the possible academic measures or measures under employment law, civil service law, disciplinary law, civil law or criminal law that could be implemented.

(6) Until such time as it is demonstrated that research misconduct has occurred, information relating to the individuals involved in the proceedings and the findings of the investigation shall be treated in confidence. Should research misconduct not be proven, the complainant must continue to be protected, provided the allegations cannot be shown to have been made against their better judgement.

(7) The main reasons that led to the termination of the proceedings or to the submission of a report to the University President shall be communicated to the respondent and the complainant in writing without delay.

(8) The outcome of the investigation will be communicated to the research organizations concerned and, where applicable, to any third parties with a legitimate interest in the decision.

(9) There is no internal appeal procedure against the Board's decision.

(10) At the end of a formal investigation, the ombudsperson shall identify all those who are (were) involved in the case. The ombudsperson shall provide advice on safeguarding personal and research integrity to any persons who through no fault of their own have been involved in cases of research misconduct.

(11) The files of the formal investigation shall be kept for 30 years. The persons named in connection with a case of research misconduct have the right to request from the ombudsperson a letter (regarding their exoneration) for the duration of the file retention period.

Section 17 **Further procedure**

If research misconduct has been identified, the University President shall examine the need for further measures to safeguard the research standards of the university and the rights of all those directly or indirectly affected. The penalties and repercussions of research misconduct depend on the circumstances of the individual case and are subject to the provisions of the relevant statutory framework. Possible consequences of research misconduct are:

1. Academic/research-related consequences, e.g.
 - a. Revocation of academic degrees or academic titles awarded by Saarland University
 - b. Withdrawal of teaching authorization
 - c. Withdrawal of the right to supervise academic work
 - d. Retraction of scientific publications
 - e. Informing cooperation partners, research/scientific organizations and other institutions/organizations
 - f. Informing relevant third parties
 - g. Informing the public/press
2. Disciplinary action under civil-service and public-sector employment law, e.g.
 - a. Warning/reprimand
 - b. Extraordinary dismissal (if applicable, termination on the grounds of strong suspicion)
 - c. Rescinding the employment contract
 - d. Discharge from the civil service
 - e. Consequences under civil service law
3. Consequences under civil or administrative law, e.g.
 - a. A ban on entering university premises may be issued
 - b. An action may be brought to recover property
 - c. Claims for cessation and desistance of the infringement under copyright law, personal rights law, patent law and competition law
 - d. Repayment claims (scholarships, external funding or the like)
 - e. Claims for damages by the university or third parties in cases of personal injury, material damage or the like
4. Consequences under criminal or regulatory law, for example due to
 - a. Copyright infringement
 - b. Falsification of documents (including falsification of technical records)
 - c. Damage to property (including alteration of data)
 - d. Property crime (including fraud and embezzlement)
 - e. Violation of personal privacy and confidentiality
 - f. Crime against life and personal injury

Part 6
Final provision

Section 18
Commencement

These regulations shall come into force when they are announced in the Official Bulletin of the Institutions of Higher Education in Saarland (*Dienstblatt der Hochschulen des Saarlandes*). At the same time, the Principles of Good Scientific Practice at Saarland University (*Grundsätze der Universität des Saarlandes zur Sicherung guter wissenschaftlicher Praxis*) of 6 June 2001 (Official Gazette 2001, p. 342) and the Guidance on Preventing and Responding to Scientific Misconduct at Saarland University (*Richtlinie zur Vermeidung von und zum Umgang mit wissenschaftlichem Fehlverhalten in der Universität des Saarlandes*) (Official Gazette 1999, p. 54) shall cease to apply.

Saarbrücken, 14 November 2023

President of Saarland University Univ.-Prof. Dr. Manfred Schmitt