

Research Ethics Policy			
Document type:	Policy		
Document number:	RKE-115	Version:	06
Department:	Research and Knowledge Exchange		
Approved by:	Senate	Date approved:	21/01/2026
Effective from:	22/01/2026	Review date:	22/01/2029
Publication:	SOAS website		
Related documents:			
Documents replaced:	RKE-115-05 Research Ethics Policy		
<p><i>Note: All policies must be read in conjunction with all other SOAS policy, procedure and guidance documents. Printed copies of policies may not be the most up to date, therefore please refer to the policy pages on the SOAS external website or intranet for the latest version.</i></p>			

1. Introduction

- 1.1. SOAS University of London is a research-led institution, committed to meeting international standards in research and research-led teaching in all of the University's specialist academic disciplines.
- 1.2. SOAS and its researchers are required to maintain the highest ethical standards and to foster values of honesty, rigour, openness, care and respect. To meet these aims, SOAS will offer its research community:
 - An extensive framework for research ethics, comprising clear policies, practices and procedures to support researchers;
 - Suitable learning, training, and mentoring opportunities to support the development of its researchers;
 - Robust management systems to ensure that policies relating to research integrity are implemented, that potential concerns are identified at an early stage and that mechanisms to support researchers in need of assistance are provided;
 - Awareness among researchers that high standards are expected of them.
- 1.3. This policy expresses SOAS's commitment to ethical standards by setting out the general ethical principles which SOAS requires its researchers to follow and by listing in detail the obligations of SOAS and its researchers, as per Appendix 1. This policy also defines what is meant by research misconduct: if research has failed to meet the University's ethical standards. The terms of implementation of this policy are further operationalised in the following adopted policies and procedures, namely:
 - Procedural Guidance
 - Code of Practice (Using Personal Data in Research)
 - Investigating Allegations of Research Misconduct

- 1.4. This policy applies equally to SOAS academic staff and students, including distance-learning students conducting research at any level, and to any other person, regardless of their status, engaged in research under the auspices of SOAS, on behalf of, or in association with SOAS (for example, independent contractors, consultants, visiting members of staff, staff from other institutions, emeritus staff, and staff on honorary appointments). Research conducted collaboratively with other institutions or non-SOAS researchers is covered by this policy to the extent that it involves a contribution from a researcher acting under the auspices of the University. This policy does not apply to research conducted by individuals in a private capacity.
- 1.5. Overall the policy is adopted in line with the principles set out in the revised 2025 Concordat to Support Research Integrity and is further aligned with the work of the UK Research Integrity Office and Research Councils UK.
- 1.6. The revised Concordat continues to rest upon five-central principles and five-core commitments in order to maintain highest rigorous standards in research, as set out in (3.2) below. For each of these areas, responsibility is apportioned to the research community, employers of researchers as well as funders of academic research to ensure that responsible research practice is grounded in high standards of integrity.
- 1.7. Given this framework, SOAS University of London formally seeks to align its policies, procedures, guidance and training in line with the Concordat, maintaining the commitments and principles as they apply to an employer of researchers. Coupled with that is the formal commitment to continuous improvement. For the research community at SOAS, researchers are reminded of the core principles, commitments and expectations that come with alignment to the Concordat.
- 1.8. With SOAS's expanding research portfolio, which now includes the Centre for Anthropology and Mental Health Research in Action (CAMHRA), this policy is further aligned to the principles as set out in the UK Policy Framework for Health and Social Care Research. However given the nature of SOAS's present academic discipline specialisms, this does not extend to the principles as they pertain to interventional health and social care research¹. The applicable principles as set out by the Health Regulation Authority (HRA) are included in Appendix 4.

¹ Outlined at Principles 16 through to 19. Interventional research being defined as: "Research involving a change in treatment, care or other services made for the purpose of the research. Does not refer to research involving other methodological 'interventions', e.g. issuing a postal survey." As per the HRA website: "This policy framework sets out principles of good practice in the management and conduct of health and social care research in the UK. These principles protect and promote the interests of patients, service users and the public in health and social care research, by describing ethical conduct and proportionate, assurance-based management of health and social care research, so as to support and facilitate high-quality research in the UK that has the confidence of patients, service users and the public. It is for organisations and individuals that have responsibilities for health and social care research. This includes funders, sponsors, researchers and their employers, research sites and care providers."

2. Version

- 2.1. The present Research Ethics Policy was reviewed by the Research Ethics Panel (REP) on 8 October 2025 and was approved by the Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee on 21 October 2025. The revised policy set out here supersedes all previous versions issued.
- 2.2. The policy will be reviewed and updated as necessary to take account of developments in these standards, as well as legal requirements.

3. Definitions

- 3.1. The following definitions are hereby adopted by the policy. In line with the revised *Concordat*.², SOAS recognises that research integrity is required to be carried out according to the principles of the *Concordat*, and in a way that is trustworthy, ethical, and responsible.
- 3.2. Research practice, from inception through to publication and dissemination is required to adhere to the five-core principles to maintain the highest standards of research integrity as set out in the *Concordat*. These principles are outlined as follows:
 - Honesty is crucial, from the presentation of research ideas and goals, through to authorship and financial contributions, and on to findings. Examples include honesty in: reporting research methods and procedures; gathering data and information; referencing work; representing and acknowledging the work of others; conveying interpretations; and making justifiable claims based on research findings.
 - Rigour is demonstrated by behaviour that is in line with prevailing disciplinary norms and standards, including the use of appropriate methods. It may be evidenced through adherence to procedures, standards of practice and agreed protocols, as appropriate, and is expected when drawing interpretations and conclusions from research, including when communicating findings. The integrity of the research record should be protected through secure and rigorous approaches.
 - Transparency and open communication provide the foundation for the actions taken when conducting or communicating about research. Examples may include: declaring potential competing interests; reporting research data collection methods; acknowledging the use of tools such as emerging technologies; analysing and interpreting data; and publishing or otherwise sharing findings. This may include appropriate open research practices. It permits humility in the process, acknowledging errors committed in good faith and ensuring honest mistakes are seen as productive elements of research.
 - Care and respect are expected for everyone and everything involved in the research system, and for the protection of the integrity of the research record. They should be extended to everyone involved in the research process, all participants in

² Revised [Concordat to Support Research Integrity](#) (2025), (pp. 3/5).

research, and for the subjects, users and beneficiaries of research, including humans, animals, the environment and cultural objects. Those engaged with research must also show care and respect for the integrity of the research record.

- Accountability is expected of everyone individually and collectively to create a research environment in which diverse individuals and organisations are empowered and enabled to own the research process and be accountable for their contributions to the research record. This includes being accountable to participants involved in research, and a responsibility to hold individuals and organisations to account when behaviour falls short of the standards set by the *Concordat*.

4. Principles of Research Integrity

- 4.1. With its formal commitment to continuous improvement, SOAS endeavours to embed principles as they relate to research integrity throughout its policies, procedures and culture, seeking to enhance the research environment and fostering a thriving research community commitment to the advancement of knowledge.
- 4.2. SOAS further adheres to the approach as set out by [UK Research and Innovation \(UKRI\)](#), 'Research is carried out with a high level of integrity if it upholds values of honesty, rigour, transparency and open communication, as well as care and respect for those involved in research and accountability for a positive research environment.'
- 4.3. All research conducted under the auspices of SOAS University of London is required to adhere to established ethical, legal, regulatory and professional frameworks, obligations, and standards. All researchers at SOAS are required to seek the appropriate level of ethical approval prior to any research being undertaken.
- 4.4. In terms of the broader principles underpinning this area, SOAS requires its researchers of all levels to adhere to them
 - *Beneficence*: Benefits from the research should outweigh any risks
 - *Justice*: Benefits and risks should be fairly distributed across populations
 - *Autonomy*: Participation in academic research is entirely voluntary. Potential research participants should be given the requisite information to make an informed decision as to whether they wish to participate, together with the option of withdrawal at any juncture without consequence.
 - *Non-maleficence*: Potential risks arising from the research endeavour should be appropriately mitigated and designed to reduce the instance of harm.
- 4.5. [Relationship with Professional Codes and Standards](#)
- 4.6. All research carried out at SOAS University of London must comply with relevant legal, regulatory, professional and ethical requirements and standards. This includes, but is not limited to, existing Data Protection Legislation, UK Policy Framework for Health and Social Care Research, and the Concordat to Support Research Integrity.

- 4.7. In the unlikely event of conflict between professional standards and this present policy as adopted (or SOAS's ethical procedures), SOAS's policy is required to be followed. Appendix 2 provides for a list of professional bodies and associations.

5. General Principles

- 5.1. Regardless of the level of Researcher, retrospective submissions for ethical approval will not be authorised. Given this, any research data that has been gathered in contravention of the requirements set out in the Research Ethics Policy and associated procedures cannot be utilised.
- 5.2. For students enrolled on Taught programmes (Undergraduate / Masters degrees) who may be undertaking some limited primary research, the utilisation of covert methods will not be approved or authorised.
- 5.3. Students engaging in primary research must carry out their own data collection, although in appropriate circumstances and with the support of their supervisors research assistants and/or translators may be permitted.
- 5.4. Researchers of all levels are required to declare actual or potential conflicts of interest should they arise in relation to research activities. The handling of this is formally built into the ethics framework. Failure to adequately address this could compromise the trustworthiness of work as it relates to research proposals, publications and public communications as well as in all review activities.

Caldicott Guardian

- 5.5. A [Caldicott Guardian](#) is a senior person responsible for protecting the confidentiality of people's health and care information ensuring that it is used properly. All NHS organisations and local authorities which provide social services must have a Caldicott Guardian. SOAS University of London does not have a Caldicott Guardian.

6. Collaborative Research

- 6.1. When research is conducted collaboratively, particularly within inter-disciplinary or international partnerships, there must be clear and explicit agreement about the standards and frameworks that will apply. In international collaborations, partners should agree to conduct their research according to the same high standards of research integrity as expected in the UK and to investigate any suspected deviation from these standards. In particular, any alleged research misconduct must be brought to the immediate attention of the project leader(s) and to the senior responsible officer in the University or institute (employer) in order for it to be investigated according to the policies and procedures of the partner with the primary responsibility to do so, while respecting the laws and sovereignty of the States of all participating parties.

- 6.2. In formal, large scale and often externally-funded international research projects there may be questions as to which country should conduct the investigation if allegations of misconduct are raised and what is to happen when the relevant national policies are at odds with each other. The Coordinating Committee of the OECD Global Science Forum recommends the establishment of an agreement for collaborative research that addresses the promotion of responsible conduct in research and describes the procedures for the investigation of allegations of research misconduct within the project.
- 6.3. The OECD Global Science Forum Committee has produced boiler-plate text for International Agreements, which should be embodied in the contracts that establish the collaborative project. This is to be found in Annex 3, as are the responsibilities of individual and institutional partners in cross-boundary research collaborations.

7. Research Misconduct

- 7.1. SOAS recognises that while the responsibility for ensuring that no misconduct occurs rests above all with individual researchers, it bears the primary responsibility for investigating allegations of research misconduct. SOAS undertakes to have procedures that deal effectively and fairly with research misconduct and to ensure that anyone investigating such allegations has the knowledge, skills, experience and authority to do so.
- 7.2. SOAS is also responsible for taking appropriate steps to remedy any situations arising from an investigation. This can include: imposing sanctions, correcting the research record, and reporting to regulatory and statutory bodies, research participants, funders or other professional bodies as circumstances, as contractual obligations and statutory requirements dictate.
- 7.3. Excluding areas that may fall short of outright misconduct, such as Questionable Research Practice(s) (QRP), in line with the *Concordat* SOAS recognises that research misconduct may take several forms including: fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, failure to meet legal, ethical and professional obligations, misrepresentation and improper dealing with allegations of misconduct.³

8. Audit and Assurance

- 8.1. To ensure adherence to this policy and commitment to the *Concordat* periodic internal audit and assurance activities to monitor compliance with the terms of this policy may be undertaken by the Research and Knowledge Exchange Delivery (RKED) team.
- 8.2. These internal checks are separate and apart from any routine audit activity that SOAS University of London is subject to, including that from research funding bodies.

³ Greater detail on each of these areas is set out in the *Concordat* at Annex A: Definitions.

Appendix 1: Commitments Undertaken by SOAS University of London

Detailed below are the formal responsibilities as set out in the revised 2025 [Concordat to Support Research Integrity](#) for both the research community at SOAS as well as the University itself as an employer of researchers

The research community is responsible for:			
Commitments 1 and 2	Commitment 3	Commitment 4	Commitment 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> understanding and maintaining the expected standards of integrity relevant to their research throughout the research cycle being open and transparent about their research methodologies, and honest when errors are made complying with ethical, legal, regulatory and professional frameworks, obligations and standards as required by statutory and regulatory authorities, and by employers, funders and other relevant stakeholders ensuring that all their research is subject to ongoing, active and appropriate consideration of ethical issues maintaining trust in research, including by reporting any concerns of research misconduct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> keeping their knowledge up to date on research integrity principles and how their responsibilities may evolve at different stages of their career designing, conducting, and reporting research in ways that embed integrity and ethical practice throughout collaborating with others to build and maintain research environments that encourage research integrity, including seeking support from those in leadership and supervisory roles, as needed, to resolve issues adhering to and promoting standards of research integrity when working with partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> honesty when reporting any concerns about potential breaches of integrity and declaring conflicts of interest supporting and participating in any investigation, its management and implementation of any recommendations, as required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> upholding trust and confidence in research in the UK through the work they undertake, host, fund, partner or collaborate on, support, and disseminate finding opportunities to implement, reward, and share ideas, good practice, and learning experiences inside and outside their own organisation

Employers are responsible for:			
Commitments 1 and 2	Commitment 3	Commitment 4	Commitment 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> maintaining a research environment that values research integrity and creates the conditions necessary for honest errors to be openly admitted without undue detriment developing transparent, robust, and fair research integrity related policies within an appropriate organisational governance structure demonstrating, through periodic review, that policies and procedures are in place to ensure that research is conducted in accordance with standards of best practice supporting the research community to understand and act according to expected ethical, legal, regulatory and professional frameworks, obligations, and standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> adhering to the principles of the Concordat across all functions of the organisation that have a role in the research environment reflecting recognised best practice that supports a culture of integrity in their systems, processes, and practices reviewing actions taken to meet the commitments of the Concordat, and working to continuously improve providing and promoting training and development opportunities to the research community, and encouraging uptake adopting mechanisms to acknowledge, promote, and reward responsible research practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> publishing policies related to questionable research practices and research misconduct that are accessible to the research community and that include a confidential reporting mechanism through a named point of contact maintaining fair and transparent processes, managing conflicts of interest, using external advisers where needed, and offering appeals processes preparing and, when necessary, providing training for those running investigations and serving as panellists ensuring investigations are completed in a timely manner, bearing in mind the need to support all parties involved documenting the process, acting on the outcomes, and, where concerns are upheld, ensuring appropriate action is taken, avoiding the use of non-disclosure agreements providing information to third parties as required under any formal agreements, such as with research funders or statutory bodies taking reasonable steps to protect all parties involved from undue pressure, victimisation, or unwarranted negative consequences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> publish up to date information on their organisation's website including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> named senior role(s) responsible for oversight of research integrity first point(s) of contact for research integrity matters taking reasonable steps to ensure that any research carried out by a partner or subcontractor aligns with the principles set out in this Concordat publishing, on their organisation's website, an annual statement, approved by their own governing body, reporting progress on meeting the Concordat principles and commitments. This statement must include a summary table of the number and types of allegations reported to the organisation and investigations undertaken. Organisations are encouraged, but not required to, use the Concordat annual statement template

Appendix 2: Professional Codes and Standards

1. Professional associations have importance for disseminating best practice, as well as the need for the researchers to comply with professional frameworks. There is an expectation for researchers to comply with ethical, legal and professional frameworks, obligations and standards as required by statutory and regulatory authorities, as well as by employers, funders and other relevant stakeholders.
2. Academic departments and Centres at SOAS University of London already have strong links with one or more professional associations and refer to their ethical code of practice. It would be beneficial to all departments, centres and individual academics to adopt the code of conduct of one or more professional associations. This does not imply an obligation for individual academics to become members of these associations but that the departmental website would provide a link to their Code of Practice, where relevant, for the guidance of staff and students. Doing so would help SOAS to comply with the requirement of the Concordat to make professional obligations and standards accessible to its researchers.
3. Below is a collated set of the professional associations currently referenced by academic members of staff in the departments and centres of SOAS.

Department / Research area	Code	Indicative Guide Links
General	European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity	https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/guidance/european-code-of-conduct-for-research-integrity_horizon_en.pdf
	Singapore Statement on Research Integrity	https://www.wcrif.org/guidance/singapore-statement
	Montreal Statement	https://www.wcrif.org/guidance/montreal-statement
	Helsinki Declaration (WMA)	https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki/
	UNESCO, Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights	https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/universal-declaration-bioethics-and-human-rights?hub=387
Anthropology	ASA Ethical Guidelines for Good Research Practice	https://www.theasa.org/ethics/guidelines.shtml
	EC Research Ethics in Ethnography/Anthropology	https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/other/hi/ethics-guide-ethnog-anthrop_en.pdf
Development Studies	Institute for Development Studies	https://www.ids.ac.uk/download.php?file=wp-content/uploads/2023/05/IDS-Research-Ethics-Policy-2020.pdf
	Academy of Social Sciences	https://acss.org.uk/publications/ethics-and-integrity-in-research/
Economics	American Economic Association	https://www.aeaweb.org/about-aea/code-of-conduct
	Royal Economic Society	https://res.org.uk/about-us/code-of-conduct/
History of Art	UK Museums Association	https://www.museumsassociation.org/campaigns/ethics/#
History	Royal Historical Society	https://royalhistsoc.org/policy/position-papers/statement-on-good-practice/
	American Historical Association	https://www.historians.org/resource/statement-on-standards-of-professional-conduct/
Law	Law Society Professional Ethics	https://www.lawsociety.org.uk/topics/ethics
Media Studies	Media, Communication and Cultural Studies Association	https://www.meccsa.org.uk/news/statement-of-research-ethics-guidelines/
Music	Society for Ethnomusicology	https://www.ethnomusicology.org/page/EthicsStatement
	British Forum for Ethnomusicology	https://bfe.org.uk/bfe-ethics-statement
Politics	International Studies Association	https://www.isanet.org/ISA/Governance/Policy-and-Procedures/ID/9/ISA-Code-of-Conduct
Religions and Philosophies	British Association for the Study of Religions	https://basr.ac.uk/ethics/

Appendix 3: Collaborative and/or International Research

1. International Agreements

1.1. The OECD Global Science Forum Committee has produced a boiler-plate text for International Agreements, which should be embodied in the contracts that establish the collaborative project.

1.2. We, the parties, agree:

- i. to conduct our research according to the standards of research integrity, as defined in the (specify the national codes of conduct and disciplinary or national ethical guidelines that apply);
- ii. that any suspected deviation from these standards, in particular alleged research misconduct, will be brought to the immediate attention of (all designated contact point(s)) and investigated according to the policies and procedures of (to be filled in with the body with primary responsibility), while respecting the laws and sovereignty of the States of all participating parties;
- iii. to cooperate in and support any such investigations; and
- iv. to accept (subject to any appeal process) the conclusions of any such investigation and to take appropriate actions

2. Responsibilities of Individual and Institutional Partners in Cross-Boundary Research Collaborations

2.1. Overall Collaborative Responsibilities

- i. Integrity: Collaborating partners should take responsibility for the trustworthiness of the collaborative research.
- ii. Trust: The behaviour of all collaborating partners should be worthy of the trust of all other partners. Responsibility for establishing and maintaining this level of trust lies with all collaborating partners.
- iii. Purpose: Collaborative research should be initiated and conducted for purposes that advance knowledge to the benefit of humankind.
- iv. Goals: Collaborating partners should agree at the outset on the goals of the research. Changes in goals should be negotiated and agreed to by all partners.

2.2. Responsibilities in Establishing and Managing the Collaboration

- i. Communication: Collaborating partners should communicate with each other as frequently and openly as necessary to foster full, mutual understanding of the research
- ii. Agreements: Agreements that govern collaborative research should be understood and ratified by all collaborating partners. Agreements that

- unduly or unnecessarily restrict dissemination of data, findings or other research products should be avoided.
- iii. **Compliance with Laws, Policies and Regulations:** The collaboration as a whole should be in compliance with all laws, policies and regulations to which it is subject. Collaborating partners should promptly determine how to address conflicting laws, policies or regulations that apply to the research.
 - iv. **Costs and Rewards:** The costs and rewards of collaborative research should be distributed fairly among collaborating partners.
 - v. **Transparency:** Collaborative research should be conducted and its results disseminated transparently and honestly, with as much openness as possible under existing agreements. Sources of funding should be fully and openly declared.
 - vi. **Resource Management:** Collaborating partners should use human, animal, financial and other resources appropriately.
 - vii. **Monitoring:** Collaborating partners should monitor the progress of research projects to foster the integrity and the timely completion and dissemination of the work

2.3. Responsibilities in Establishing and Managing the Collaboration

- i. **Roles and Responsibilities:** Collaborating partners should come to mutual understandings about their roles and responsibilities in the planning, conduct and dissemination of research projects. Such understandings should be renegotiated when roles or responsibilities change.
- ii. **Customary Practices and Assumptions:** Collaborating partners should openly discuss their customary practices and assumptions related to the research. Diversity of perspectives, expertise and methods, and differences in customary practices, standards and assumptions that may compromise the integrity of the research should be addressed openly.
- iii. **Conflict:** Collaborating partners should seek prompt resolution of conflicts, disagreements and misunderstandings, at the individual or institutional level, as necessary.
- iv. **Authority of Representation:** Collaborating partners should come to agreement on who has authority to speak on behalf of the collaboration.
- v. **Recognition of all Partners:** The contributions of all partners in research collaborations, especially junior partners, should receive full and appropriate recognition.

2.4. Responsibilities for Outcomes of Collaborative Research

- i. **Data, Intellectual Property and Research Records:** Collaborating partners should come to agreement, at the outset and later as needed, on the use, management, sharing and ownership of data, intellectual property, and research records
- ii. **Publication:** Collaborating partners should come to agreement, at the outset and later as needed, on how publication and other dissemination decisions will be made.
- iii. **Authorship and Acknowledgement:** Collaborating partners should come to agreement, at the outset and later as needed, on standards for authorship

- and acknowledgement of joint research products. Publications and other products should state the contributions of all contributing parties.
- iv. **Accountability:** Collaborating partners should be accountable to each other, to funders and to other stakeholders in the accomplishment of the research

Appendix 4 Principles applying to health and social care research

SOAS adheres to the Principles which apply to all health and social care research which is carried out under its auspices and sponsorship as set out in the [UK Policy Framework for Health and Social Care Research](#).

8. Principles that apply to all health and social care research

8.1 The following statement of principles serves as a benchmark for good practice that the management and conduct of all health and social care research in the UK are expected to meet.

Principle 1: Safety

The safety and well-being of the individual prevail over the interests of science and society.

Principle 2: Competence

All the people involved in managing and conducting a research project are qualified by education, training and experience, or otherwise competent under the supervision of a suitably qualified person, to perform their tasks.

Principle 3: Scientific and Ethical Conduct

Research projects are scientifically sound and guided by ethical principles in all their aspects.

Principle 4: Patient, Service User and Public Involvement

Patients, service users and the public are involved in the design, management, conduct and dissemination of research, unless otherwise justified.

Principle 5: Integrity, Quality and Transparency

Research is designed, reviewed, managed and undertaken in a way that ensures integrity, quality and transparency.

Principle 6: Protocol

The design and procedure of the research are clearly described and justified in a research proposal or protocol, where applicable conforming to a standard template and/or specified contents - see [HRA Planning and Improving Research page](#).

Principle 7: Legality

The researchers and sponsor familiarise themselves with relevant legislation and guidance in respect of managing and conducting the research.

Principle 8: Benefits and Risks

Before the research project is started, any anticipated benefit for the individual participant and other present and future recipients of the health or social care in question is weighed against the foreseeable risks and inconveniences once they have been mitigated (A formal, structured risk assessment is only expected where identified as essential. The risk: benefit ratio will normally be sufficiently described and considered as part of review processes such as research ethics committee review.)

Principle 9: Approval

A research project is started only if a research ethics committee and any other relevant approval body (i.e. the HRA, the Administration of Radioactive Substances Advisory Committee (ARSAC), the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority (HFEA) or the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA)) have favourably reviewed the research proposal or protocol and related information, where their review is expected or required.

Principle 10: Information about the Research

In order to avoid waste, information about research projects (other than those for educational purposes) is made publicly available before they start (unless a deferral is agreed by or on behalf of the research ethics committee).

Principle 11: Accessible Findings

Other than research for educational purposes and early phase trials, the findings, whether positive or negative, are made accessible, with adequate consent and privacy safeguards, in a timely manner after they have finished, in compliance with any applicable regulatory standards, i.e. legal requirements or expectations of regulators. In addition, where appropriate, information about the findings of the research is available, in a suitable format and timely manner, to those who took part in it, unless otherwise justified.

Principle 12: Choice

Research participants (Either directly, or indirectly through the involvement of data or tissue that could identify them) are afforded respect and autonomy, taking account of their capacity to understand. Where there is a difference between the research and the standard practice that they might otherwise experience, research participants are given information to understand the distinction and make a choice, unless a research ethics committee agrees otherwise. Where participants' explicit consent is sought, it is voluntary and informed. Where consent is refused or withdrawn, this is done without reprisal.

Principle 13: Insurance and Indemnity

Adequate (Special provision is not expected unless existing arrangements (e.g. professional insurance, membership of NHS Litigation Authority schemes) provide inadequate cover) provision is made for insurance or indemnity to cover liabilities which may arise in relation to the design, management and conduct of the research project.

Principle 14: Respect for Privacy

All information collected for or as part of the research project is recorded, handled and stored appropriately and in such a way and for such time that it can be accurately reported, interpreted and verified, while the confidentiality of individual research participants remains appropriately protected. Data and tissue collections are managed in a transparent way that demonstrates commitment to their appropriate use for research and appropriate protection of privacy.