



**UKCORI**  
UK Committee on  
Research Integrity

## Enablers and inhibitors of research integrity: committee response, June 2024

The UK Committee on Research Integrity extends warm thanks to colleagues from Circlera, a partnership between UKRN, UKRIO and the Science Policy Research Unit (University of Sussex) for their work in the production of this report. We note the report makes a few observations that we wish to highlight and discuss further with the research sector.

### The strength of mentorship

- **High quality mentorship leads to high quality research:** The committee was pleased to see that the literature reflected the importance of mentorship for achieving high levels of research integrity. We agree that this support is crucial.

### Gaps in the evidence base

- **Lack of evidence for intervention evaluation:** A key finding of the report is the surprising lack of evidence in both academic and grey literature concerning the evaluation of interventions. This gap indicates a need for the sector to robustly evaluate implemented or piloted interventions, including training outcomes, and share what is effective in enhancing research integrity and why.
- **Skewed research focus:** The report highlights that available literature on research integrity is heavily skewed towards quantitative academic research, with qualitative research and research outside academia being underrepresented. To address these disciplinary-based evidence gaps, we recommend that research funding be allocated to close the evidence gap in these underrepresented areas.

## Data sharing and transparency

- **Challenges of sharing findings, data, and records:** We acknowledge that the sharing of findings, data and records is not always straightforward, and some records cannot be shared due to the nature of the information or various constraints relating to it. Where these constraints exist, it is entirely appropriate and correct not to share this information, although the reasons for not sharing should be transparent. We note that data sharing is discussed in the report, but that “records” (rather than data) is more appropriate terminology for some disciplines.
- **Environmental cost of data and record storing and processing:** The environmental implications of data and record storage must be considered. Care must be taken not to generate ‘data dumps’ but instead to focus on compliance with the FAIR\* principles.
- **Support for preregistration:** While the committee endorses the report’s support for pre-registration, we concur with the authors that the necessary infrastructure or funds may not yet be in place to facilitate widespread preregistration. Investment in this area is needed to enable broader implementation.
- **Limitations of preregistration:** We recognise that preregistration is not suitable or appropriate for all types of research, particularly those that are not hypothesis-driven.
- **Balancing transparency and trusted research:** We also acknowledge the need to balance the need for transparency with the expectations of ‘Trusted Research’. It is essential to share data responsibly, balancing openness with the protection of sensitive information.

\*[FAIR](#) stands for Findability, Accessibility, Interoperability, and Reusability



**UKCORI**  
UK Committee on  
Research Integrity