

Editorial**SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT: POISONING THE WELL IN THE FIELD OF REHABILITATION SCIENCES**Muhammad Naveed Babur¹

Rehabilitation science is becoming apparent and eminent among the scientific community, rehabilitation educators and rehabilitation clinicians in upcoming decades. ⁽¹⁾ Usually in the incubation phase of any profession some of the educationist and researchers becomes recidivist in violating the research integrity due to their unique expertise in drylabbing and fictional abilities. Unethical research and writing practices are wrong and must be avoided, no excuse for unethical behavior. In Rehabilitation research, therefore, requires the wrongdoer forthrightly to acknowledge their bad act and the harm it has done rather than offering excuses or minimizing the magnitude of the harm. ⁽²⁾

“Research misconduct means falsification, fabrication or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting the research results. Fabrication is making up the data or results and recording or reporting them. Falsification is manipulation of research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record. Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit. Research misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion. In scientific inquiry and academic research, fabrication is the intentional misrepresentation of research results by making up the data, such as that reported in a journal article.”⁽³⁾ Honesty is a prime virtue for the scientific research, choose honest colleague and seniors for research and writing , plan ahead don't rush, learn medical writing like medical sciences, explore online resources, share whatever you learn, led by examples. It would be perverse for the scientific community to adopt a stance that rehabilitation is not possible when the reluctance of many of its members to pursue official sanctions for misconduct suggests that they feel rehabilitation is possible. ^(4, 5, 6)

The cost of scientific misconduct damage to others, the integrity of scientific knowledge, non-productive lines of enquiry based on false information, the reputation of colleagues co-authors, collaborators, and institutions, waste of financial resources to investigate/repeat, loss of confidence in the public, also damage to self-loss of reputation, loss of funding, loss of career, loss of job. ^(7,8)

To protect the integrity of rehabilitation science, we must encourage a sense of collective responsibility for creating conditions where wrongdoers won't reoffend and where scientists are less vulnerable to temptations of fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism.

1. Isra Institute of Rehabilitation sciences, Isra University Islamabad.

Correspondence

Professor Dr Muhammad Naveed Babur, Principal, Isra Institute of Rehabilitation sciences, Isra University Islamabad.

Email: naveedphysio@gmail.com

7. Drenth, P.J.D. Scientists at fault: causes and consequences of misconduct in science, in: European science and scientists between freedom and responsibility. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Community (1999).
8. Levi, B. G. “Investigation Finds that One Ludent Physicist Engaged in Scientific Misconduct.” *Physics Today* 55(November 2002):15-17.

References

1. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Assessing Rehabilitation Science and Engineering; Brandt EN Jr., Pope AM, editors. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 1997.
2. Tate DG: The state of rehabilitation research: art or science? *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2006 Feb; 87(2):160-6.
3. Mondaq.com. (n.d.). Research Misconduct: A New Area Of Focus For Government Enforcement - Food, Drugs, Healthcare, Life Sciences - United States. [online] Available at:<http://www.mondaq.com> [Accessed 22 Jan. 2019].
4. Hilton SR, Slotnick HB. Protoperfessionalism: How professionalisation occurs across the continuum of medical education. *Med Educ.* 2005;39:58-65.
5. Ginsburg S, Regehr G, Hatala R, et al. Context, conflict, and resolution: A new conceptual framework for evaluating professionalism. *Acad Med.* 2000;75(10 suppl):S6-S11.
6. Lafollette, M. *Stealing into print: fraud, plagiarism, and misconduct in scientific publishing.* Berkeley: University of California Press (1992).