

This is the translation into English of the "Ordnung (des Senates) der Leuphana Universität Lüneburg zur Sicherung guter wissenschaftlicher Praxis und zum Verfahren zum Umgang mit wissenschaftlichem Fehlverhalten, 2022".

In the event of discrepancies or differences in interpretation between the different language versions, only the official German version shall apply.

Regulations of Leuphana University Lüneburg on Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice and on the Procedure for Dealing with Scientific Misconduct

The Senate of Leuphana University Lüneburg has, on the basis of Art. 3 Para. 1 Sentence 1 No. 1, Art. 41 Para. 1 Sentence 1 Lower Saxony Higher Education Act (NHG) in the version of 26 February 2007 (Nds. GVBl. p. 69), last amended by Art. 7 of the Act of 23 March 2022 (Nds. GVBl. p. 218), adopted the following regulations of Leuphana University Lüneburg on 15 June 2022 on safeguarding good scientific practice and on the procedure for dealing with scientific misconduct.

Preamble

Honesty on the part of scientists is a basic prerequisite for scientific work. Unlike error, dishonesty in scientific work contradicts the essence of science. The honesty of scientists cannot be replaced by any set of rules. Good scientific practice, which in the understanding of Leuphana University Lüneburg explicitly includes transfer-oriented scientific work, must be lived, taught and practiced through suitable role models and framework conditions and by anchoring them in the scientific culture of Leuphana University Lüneburg. In this way, misconduct in academic work cannot be prevented in principle, but it can be limited.

All higher education institutions are called upon, within the scope of their own responsibilities, to protect science and themselves from falsification and to take action against misuse and manipulation of scientific results. The following regulations are based on the Code of Conduct "Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice" of 1 August 2019 adopted by the General Assembly of the German Research Foundation (DFG). The following regulations of Leuphana University Lüneburg on safeguarding good scientific practice and on the procedure for dealing with scientific misconduct replace the regulations "Guidelines of Leuphana University Lüneburg on safeguarding good scientific

practice and on the procedure for dealing with scientific misconduct", which were adopted by the Senate of Leuphana University Lüneburg on 20 May 2009 and approved by the presidential board of Leuphana University Lüneburg on 3 June 2009.

All scientists working at Leuphana University Lüneburg are obliged to comply with the following guideline to safeguard good scientific practice. This obligation also applies to all members and staff of Leuphana University Lüneburg who are entrusted with scientific and science-related tasks.

SECTION I

RULES OF GOOD SCIENTIFIC PRACTICE

Art. 1 General principles of good scientific practice

- (1) Good scientific practice means adhering to recognised disciplinary principles of scientific work and always following the current state of knowledge. It requires knowledge and utilisation of current literature as well as all other publicly available research achievements and findings, the application of sound methods, as well as quality assurance and the establishment of standards in the development and application of new methods. It is characterised by scientific doubt and self-criticism, by critical examination of the findings obtained and their control, for example by the use of methods to avoid (unconscious) bias in the interpretation of results, by honesty towards the contributions of colleagues, employees, competitors and predecessors, and by careful consideration of whether and to what extent gender and diversity can be significant for the research project.
- (2) Careful quality assurance is an important characteristic of scientific honesty. Alongside honesty towards oneself, it is the basis for scientific professionalism. It is ensured by the researcher's awareness of and professional approach to good scientific practice, (critical) cooperation in scientific working groups, mutual review of work results, clear responsibility structures and clear supervisory and support obligations. Quality assurance is the responsibility of the management of scientific work units or scientific projects and is based on the correct and comprehensive documentation of all work steps, methods, scientific procedures and the resulting outcomes across all phases. Quality assurance also includes that scientists take into account rights and obligations, especially those resulting from legal requirements or contracts with third parties. They are also responsible for assessing the impact of research and ethical aspects. They obtain approvals and ethics votes where necessary.
- (3) Scientists at all career levels regularly update their knowledge of the standards of good scientific practice and the state of research. Experienced researchers and scientists in the qualification phase support each other in the continuous learning and further training process and engage in a regular exchange. Supervisors should offer doctoral researchers regular talks to clarify questions about the standards of good scientific practice.
- (4) An essential aspect of good scientific practice is responsibility for (co-) authorship and (co-) editorship. The authors of scientific publications have made a genuine, traceable contribution to the scientific text, data or software publication and are always (jointly) responsible for its content; honorary authorships are excluded. The author is accountable, identifies with the scientific result, chooses the publication body carefully and appropriately, taking into account its quality and visibility in the respective field as well as its scientific respectability, whereby the essential criterion is whether it has established its own guidelines for good scientific practice, and assumes the guarantee for its content and publication. If scientists assume the function of editors, they carefully check the quality and scientific integrity of the respective publication organ.
- (5) Rules of good collegiality and cooperation form the basis of good scientific practice. This requires the careful, unselfish and unbiased review and assessment of the scientific work of other scientists and students, of funding applications or the recognition of persons without deliberate delay. Academics shall disclose to the relevant competent body all facts that could give rise to concerns about possible conflicts of interest or bias, and shall

refrain from peer review in the event of bias. They shall treat scientific results and other external content received in confidence as confidential. Confidentiality excludes disclosure to third parties and own use. This also applies to members of scientific advisory and decision-making bodies.

- (6) Rules of good collegiality and cooperation, such as honesty, openness, timely and correct sharing of information, open knowledge sharing, orientation towards the achievement of jointly defined goals and mutual professional and human respect form the basis of ethical behaviour in scientific group processes at Leuphana University Lüneburg.
- (7) Good scientific practice is also implemented through professional science management. In addition to efforts to ensure professional project management in the implementation and monitoring of research projects, this also includes the appropriate use of third-party funds and the professional involvement of colleagues who are entrusted with science management tasks.

Art. 2 Organisational structures and management responsibility

- (1) The quality assurance of scientific work carried out at Leuphana University Lüneburg is basically the responsibility of all members and staff of Leuphana University Lüneburg who are involved in scientific and science-related tasks.
- (2) The presidential board of Leuphana University Lüneburg creates the framework conditions for scientific work, for the search of research achievements that are already publicly available, as well as the conditions for the observance and communication of good scientific practice and for career support for academics. This also includes written procedures and principles for personnel selection and academic personnel development, which, in the spirit of equal opportunities, aim to take gender equality and diversity into account and to avoid unconscious bias wherever possible.
- (3) The members of Leuphana University Lüneburg who belong to the group of university teachers and those habilitated academic and artistic staff members or university members who have been explicitly commissioned with management tasks of organisational units, research groups or centres, are responsible for management, supervision, conflict resolution and quality assurance. They ensure that
 - the research priorities of working group(s) are defined,
 - the goals of scientific work and tasks of the individual scientists and employees entrusted with science-related tasks are defined,
 - each staff member's responsibilities (rights and duties) are clearly assigned to them, and are adapted if the work focus changes,
 - the persons involved in research projects (scientists and science-accessory personnel) are in regular exchange with each other,
 - regular checks on work processes and compliance with targets are carried out,
 - the appropriate supervision and counselling of academics in early qualification and career stages (e.g. scientific and technical staff, doctoral students, bachelor's and master's students) is ensured,

- abuse of power and exploitation of dependency relationships are prevented by appropriate measures.

Art. 3 Research data

- (1) Scientists usually make documented agreements on the rights of use of generated data at the earliest possible stage of the research project. This applies especially if several institutions are involved or if it is foreseeable that participating researchers will change institutions and want to use the generated data for research. The responsible scientist who collects the data is primarily entitled to use it. Researchers who are no longer employed at Leuphana University Lüneburg should be given access to research data and materials that they were involved in developing, provided that Leuphana University Lüneburg has them available. In the case of ongoing research projects, the authorised users shall decide by mutual agreement and, in particular, in accordance with data protection regulations, whether third parties are to be given access to the data. After the completion of research projects, the publication and provision of all research results should be sought, if possible.
- (2) The management responsible for scientific projects shall establish guidelines and rules on the manner of recording and documenting data. The scientists involved shall document all information relevant to the achievement of a research result as comprehensibly as is necessary and appropriate in the respective field in order to be able to verify and evaluate the result. The origin of data, organisms, materials and software used in the research process must be identified, original sources cited and subsequent use documented. The source code of publicly accessible software must be persistent, citable and documented. If documentation is not possible in accordance with these requirements, the reasons for this shall be explained. Documentation and research results must be protected as well as possible against manipulation.
- (3) For reasons of traceability, connectivity of research and re-usability, researchers shall deposit research data and central materials on which their publications are based in recognised archives or repositories - whenever possible and following the FAIR principles ("Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Re-Usable").
- (4) Research data or research results as well as the central materials which they are based on and, if applicable, the research software used, which serve as the basis for publications or qualification work or which were created in connection with a published research project, are - depending on the respective subject area - generally to be kept accessible and traceable for at least ten years and, if possible due to their nature, in the information infrastructure of Leuphana University Lüneburg or in a subject-relevant external information infrastructure or (subject) repository, taking into account current technical and organisational standards. Shortened retention periods may be specified for research data and research objects that cannot be retained for a period of at least ten years due to their nature; the reasons for this must be explained in a comprehensible manner. The retention period shall begin on the date on which public access is established. In the case of external storage, it must be ensured that archiving requirements and periods comply with this order. If there are factual reasons for not retaining certain data, those who collected the data or in whose area of responsibility the data were collected shall explain this; the responsibility for this decision lies with the heads of the research project in which the data were collected. The storage and archiving of research data and materials - especially in the case of experimental

work - must ensure the reproducibility of the results through access to those data and materials, as well as the creation of access opportunities for authorised third parties.

Art. 4 Scientific results/publications

- (1) Scientific results shall be communicated to the scientific public in the form of scientific contributions. The decision to make scientific results publicly available must not depend on third parties, unless this conflicts with the rights of third parties (in particular data protection, copyright, know-how). In addition to publications in books and articles in scientific journals, this includes in particular scientific contributions in specialist repositories, data and software repositories as well as blogs. The quality of a scientific contribution does not depend on the publication medium. Scientific publications are - like scientific observations or scientific experiments themselves - products of the work of scientists.
- (2) Scientific publications must make the results and the methods used clear in a complete and comprehensible manner, unless the particular nature of the publication precludes this.
- (3) Results that support hypotheses and views of the authors, as well as results that contradict hypotheses and views of the authors, should be communicated equally, taking into account the manner of publication. Inconsistencies or errors in publications that are subsequently discovered must be corrected. If discrepancies or errors are the reason for the retraction of a publication, 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 marked accordingly. The same applies if researchers are informed of such discrepancies or errors by third parties.
- (4) Relevant work by other researchers should be cited appropriately, taking into account the specifics of the discipline and the manner of publication.
- (5) Scientists avoid inappropriately small publications and limit the repetition of the contents of their publications to the extent necessary for understanding the context. They cite their results that have already been made publicly available, taking into account the specifics of the discipline.

Art. 5 Authorship

- (1) The authors of an original scientific publication should be those - and only those - who have made a genuine, comprehensible contribution to the conception of the studies or experiments, to the development, analysis and interpretation of the data, as well as to the drafting, formulation or critical revision of the content of the manuscript, and who have given their written consent to its publication and thus share responsibility for the publication. Without sufficient reason, consent may not be withheld. The refusal must be justified by verifiable criticism of data, methods or results. Authors of scientific publications always bear joint responsibility for their content. Joint agreement on the order of authors is reached in good time, as a rule at the latest when the manuscript is being formulated, on the basis of comprehensible criteria and taking into account the conventions of the respective discipline.
- (2) Merely technical assistance in data collection does not constitute co-authorship, nor does the mere provision of financial resources or the general management of the department in which the research was conducted. The

same applies to non-scientific participation in a publication, especially if only individual corrections are made to a manuscript, mere suggestions are made or certain methods are taught, as is usual in the supervision of scientific work or the editing of publications. Where appropriate, persons with a contribution that does not justify authorship shall be mentioned in the acknowledgements or in the foreword.

Art. 6 Performance dimensions and evaluation criteria

A multidimensional approach is required for the evaluation of the performance of scientists. The evaluation of performance primarily follows qualitative standards, whereby quantitative indicators can only be included in the overall evaluation in a differentiated and reflected manner. Academic productivity can only be seen in conjunction with quality indicators that also take discipline-specific criteria into account. Commitment to teaching, academic self-administration, public relations or knowledge and technology transfer, for example, can be taken into account in evaluations alongside scientific performance. Furthermore, the scientific attitude such as openness to knowledge and willingness to take risks as well as contributions in the interest of society as a whole can be appreciated. Individual characteristics of the curriculum vitae, e.g. personal, family or health-related downtimes or training and qualification periods extended as a result, are also taken into account appropriately.

Art. 7 Studies and academic qualification

- (1) Special attention is paid to the training and professional support and supervision of researchers in the qualification phase. For quality assurance purposes, doctoral candidates conclude a supervision agreement with their first supervisor. Appropriate supervision is ensured through regular meetings, advice and support, as well as feedback on the progress and results of the work.
- (2) An introduction to the rules of good scientific practice is an integral part of the curriculum for bachelor's -, master's - and doctoral students. The aim is to encourage students to be honest and responsible in science and to make them aware of the possibility of scientific misconduct.
- (3) Postdoctoral candidates, as well as junior professors, must submit a written declaration as a prerequisite for admission, in which they bindingly undertake to comply with this guideline and the principles of good scientific practice. For doctoral candidates, sentence 1 applies mutatis mutandis; the submission of this declaration is a prerequisite for acceptance or admission as a doctoral candidate.

SECTION II

PROCEDURES FOR DEALING WITH SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT

Art. 8 Scientific misconduct

- (1) Scientific misconduct occurs when, in the course of scientific work, false statements are made deliberately or through gross negligence, the intellectual property of others is infringed or their research activities are sabotaged in some other way.
- (2) Misconduct may include in particular:
 1. Misrepresentation, such as by
 - a) inventing data and/or research results,
 - b) falsifying data and/or research results, e.g.
 - by suppressing and/or eliminating data and/or results obtained in the research process without disclosing this,
 - by manipulating a representation or illustration,
 - c) a falsifying representation of the state of research,
 - d) the incongruent presentation of image and associated statement,
 - e) incorrect information in a letter of application or a grant application (including false information on the publication organ and on publications in print),
 - f) incorrect information on the academic performance of applicants in selection committees.
 2. Infringement of intellectual property in relation to a copyrighted work created by others or essential scientific knowledge, hypotheses, teachings or research approaches originating from others, such as through
 - a) the unmarked adoption of third-party content without the required citation of the source ("plagiarism"),
 - b) the exploitation of research approaches and ideas, especially as a reviewer (theft of ideas),
 - c) the arrogation or unfounded assumption of scientific authorship or co-authorship,
 - d) the falsification of the content,
 - e) arbitrarily delaying the publication of a scientific paper - especially as an editor or reviewer,
 - f) unauthorised publication and unauthorised making available to third parties as long as the work, finding, hypothesis, teaching or research approach has not yet been published,
 - g) claiming (co-)authorship without the consent of the other authors.

3. Interfering with the research activities of others, such as through
 - a) sabotage of research activities (including damaging, destroying or tampering with experimental set-ups, equipment, records, hardware, software, chemicals, cell and microorganism cultures or any other property needed by another person to perform an experiment),
 - b) falsification or unauthorised disposal of research documents, research data or the documentation of research data,
 - c) the grossly erroneous, deliberately false or misleading expert evaluation of the research activities of others or the preparation of favourable expert opinions.
 4. Removal of original data, insofar as this violates legal provisions or disciplinary principles of scientific work.
- (3) Joint responsibility for misconduct may result - in the event of intent or gross negligence - from, among other things
1. active participation in the misconduct of others (in particular perpetration, instigation, and aiding and abetting),
 2. knowledge of the counterfeiting of others,
 3. co-authorship of publications containing forgeries,
 4. significant neglect of the duty of supervision.

Art. 9 Ombudspersons

- (1) Ombudspersons are contact persons, advisors and mediators in questions of good academic practice and also in cases of suspected academic misconduct. Two ombudspersons are appointed by the presidential board in consultation with the deans. The names of the ombudspersons shall be made known to the university public.
- (2) The first ombudsperson is an experienced academic from the group of university teachers at Leuphana University Lüneburg. Only such a person can be appointed who, on the basis of the information he or she may receive, would not himself or herself be compelled to act in a corresponding manner, for example as a dean or supervisor. The second ombudsperson is an experienced academic from the group of academic staff at Leuphana University Lüneburg. The ombudspersons should represent as many different subjects as possible and, preferably, be of different genders.
- (3) The term of office is three (3) years, a reappointment is permissible. The ombudspersons shall exercise their office in an honorary capacity, confidentially, independently and free of instructions. The ombudspersons shall be supported by all stakeholders in the exercise of their office.
- (4) The ombudspersons shall each have a deputy in the event of their being biased or prevented from attending. With regard to their appointment, paragraphs 2 and 3 shall apply accordingly.
- (5) The ombudspersons shall report to the presidential board both regularly once a year and separately as needed.
- (6) Members and affiliates of Leuphana University Lüneburg generally have a right of choice in that they can turn to the ombudspersons of Leuphana University Lüneburg or to the "Ombudsperson for Research" committee set up by the DFG with the procedural provisions applicable there.

Art. 10 Commission of Inquiry

- (1) Leuphana University Lüneburg will investigate any suspicion of academic misconduct at Leuphana University Lüneburg. For this purpose, a permanent commission of inquiry will be established, which will decide on the basis of free assessment of evidence.
- (2) The commission of inquiry is appointed by the presidential board for a period of three (3) years on the unanimous proposal of the deans and comprises the following members:
 - three persons from the group of university teachers,
 - one person from the group of academic staff,
 - one person from the student group,
 who are members or associates of Leuphana University Lüneburg and who are nominated from the respective status group. The members of the commission of inquiry shall each have a deputy in case of bias; sentence 1 shall apply accordingly with regard to their appointment. If a member of the commission of enquiry resigns or leaves for other reasons, a new member shall be appointed for the remaining period.
- (3) The commission shall elect a chairperson from among its members. It may consult persons who are particularly experienced in dealing with questions of scientific ethics or scientific misconduct in an advisory capacity.
- (4) If members of the investigating committee of Leuphana University Lüneburg are themselves affected by the suspicion of scientific misconduct, they are excluded from participation in the investigating committee.
- (5) The commission of inquiry shall make the necessary factual findings. The decisions of the commission of inquiry shall be taken by simple majority.

Art. 11 Procedure of the ombudspersons

- (1) As neutral contact persons, ombudspersons advise those who inform them of suspected academic misconduct or who feel that they have been wrongly exposed to such suspicions. The ombudspersons at Leuphana University Lüneburg can act independently or jointly, depending on the wishes of the person being advised. All members and affiliates of Leuphana University Lüneburg have the right to a consultation within the shortest possible time. The ombudspersons, guided by the basic principle of the presumption of innocence, examine the plausibility of the accusations, whereby the principle applies that neither the whistleblower nor the person affected by the accusations may suffer disadvantages for their own academic or professional advancement solely because of a report, which must be made in good faith. In doing so, they maintain confidentiality insofar as the suspicions are not already known beyond the circle of those directly affected, additional persons are included in the trust by mutual agreement or the ombudspersons must inform the university management immediately in the case of serious, urgent suspicion of an offence in order to initiate statutory procedures within the time limit.
- (2) The application for the opening of proceedings must be submitted in writing to the ombudspersons. As a rule, an ombudsperson does not investigate anonymously submitted suspicious activity reports. An exception is possible, in particular, if there is a suspicion of serious academic misconduct and sufficiently concrete and verifiable facts are presented.

- (3) The person affected by the suspicion of misconduct shall be heard by the ombudspersons in a non-public preliminary examination procedure. The person concerned shall be given the opportunity to comment on the incriminating facts and evidence no later than three weeks after the suspicion has become known. The ombudspersons may give the informant the opportunity to make a supplementary statement. The name of the applicant for the opening of proceedings will not be disclosed to the person concerned without his/her consent in this phase of the proceedings; the informant can decide whether the complaint - in the case of foreseeable disclosure of the name - will be withdrawn.
- (4) The task of ombudspersons lies in particular in the clarification and resolution of conflicts in matters of good scientific practice. If the reported conflict can be resolved or a reconciliation of interests can be achieved, the ombudspersons end the procedure. They must inform the person concerned and the applicant in writing.
- (5) If the reported conflict cannot be resolved and/or the suspicion of academic misconduct is substantiated, the ombudspersons will send a letter of accusation to the commission of inquiry of Leuphana University Lüneburg. The person concerned and the whistleblower receive a copy of this letter of accusation.
- (6) The decisions of the ombudspersons, in particular regarding the writing of an accusation, should be made by mutual agreement. If there is no agreement, the ombudsperson from the group of university teachers shall decide.

Art. 12 Procedure in case of suspicion of academic misconduct

- (1) The procedure for investigating allegations of scientific misconduct is a procedure of self-regulation among scientists (examination procedure). It is conducted with special care by the commission of inquiry of Leuphana University Lüneburg.
- (2) The aim of the examination procedure is to establish and evaluate facts. Assessments under labour, service, disciplinary and higher education law are not affected by this procedure.
- (3) The commission of inquiry decides on the opening of examination proceedings on the basis of an accusation. It decides either to reject the allegation and thus terminate the proceedings or to open the examination proceedings. In preparation for the decision on the opening of examination proceedings, the commission of inquiry may further clarify the facts of the case and, in particular, request the person concerned and the informant to provide additional information.
- (4) An examination procedure before the commission of inquiry may only be initiated if and to the extent that there is a reasonable suspicion of scientific misconduct against a scientist.
- (5) The examination procedure is not public. Those involved in the decision-making process are obliged to maintain confidentiality, unless they are required to inform the university management immediately in the event of serious, urgent suspicion of an offence in order to initiate statutory procedures within the prescribed time limit.
- (6) The complainant will be informed of the outcome of the procedure.
- (7) The facts on which the expressed suspicion is based shall be established. The exact ascertainment of what happened shall be executed immediately. The investigations shall be initiated or carried out by the commission of inquiry of Leuphana University Lüneburg and a report on the initiation of the investigation shall be submitted to the presidential board. They shall be conducted in strict observance of confidentiality and the protection of

all persons concerned. The commission shall be entitled to take all steps conducive to clarifying the facts of the case. It shall examine in free assessment of the evidence whether scientific misconduct has occurred. For this purpose, it may obtain all necessary information and statements and, in individual cases, also consult experts from the scientific field concerned. These experts shall examine the allegations for correctness and significance as well as with regard to options to dispel the allegations. The members and associates of the university shall provide the commission with the information necessary to clarify possible facts of academic misconduct. All evidence must be presented as part of the formal review process. The person concerned as well as the whistleblower shall be given the opportunity to comment.

- (8) The procedure shall be determined by the commission of inquiry at its own discretion. The right of the person concerned to be heard shall be respected. The person concerned is entitled to a reasonable period of time to make a statement, as a rule three weeks. He/she can demand to be heard in person, as can the person giving the information in the case of counterstatements. The right of the parties to inspect the files is governed by the general provisions. The person concerned can examine all evidence, i.e. question all witnesses or experts and provide evidence himself/herself, appoint witnesses or experts.
- (9) In the procedure, it must be ensured that persons who have been involved in processes of scientific misconduct through no fault of their own do not suffer any damage with regard to their personal and scientific integrity. In the same way, informants are to be protected from disadvantages, unless their suspicions turn out to be obviously unfounded.
- (10) If the commission does not reach the decision that the person concerned is guilty of scientific misconduct, it shall discontinue the proceedings. It shall inform the person concerned and the ombudspersons accordingly.
- (11) As a rule, the examination procedure should not take longer than six months.
- (12) There is no internal appeal procedure against the commission's termination decision.
- (13) The files of the examination procedure must be kept and archived for 30 years. Any digital documents arising in the process shall be archived digitally.

Art. 13 Proven scientific misconduct

- (1) If scientific misconduct is to be regarded as proven, the commission of inquiry shall make a corresponding written determination. The finding shall be substantiated. This must be communicated to the person concerned and the ombudspersons. The statement of reasons must at least contain:
 - a. a statement of facts,
 - b. a statement of the offence that the person concerned has committed by his/her conduct,
 - c. a statement of the evidence on which the finding is based.
- (2) There is no internal appeal procedure against the commission's determination. Determination and justification shall be communicated to the university management of Leuphana University Lüneburg with a proposal on the procedure for decision and further action.
- (3) Depending on the circumstances of the individual case, and in particular taking into account the seriousness of the misconduct found, the respective appropriate bodies or institutions shall consider sanctions to punish academic misconduct, and the initiation of corresponding proceedings within the framework of the legal options from the various fields of law, if necessary, also cumulatively, e.g.:
 - a. Academic consequences
 - Withdrawal of the doctoral degree
 - Withdrawal of the authorisation to teach
 - Withdrawal of the authority to supervise doctorates
 - b. Consequences under labour law/civil service law
 - Disciplinary warning
 - Extraordinary termination. In the case of very urgent suspicion, the university management must be informed immediately by the commission of inquiry or, if applicable, already by the ombudsperson, even before misconduct has been finally established
 - Contract termination
 - Sanctions under the Lower Saxony Disciplinary Act
 - c. Civil law consequences
 - Issuance of a ban on entering the house
 - Claims for restitution against the person concerned, e.g. for the return of stolen scientific material or the like
 - Claims for removal and injunctive relief under copyright law, personal rights law, patent law, competition law
 - Claims for repayment, for example of scholarships, third-party funds or the like
 - Claims for damages by the university to third parties
 - d. Criminal consequences

Investigating authorities are to be called in by the university management. In the case of very urgent suspicion of a criminal offence, the university management must be informed immediately by the commission or, if applicable, by the ombudspersons, even before misconduct has been finally established.

- e. Revocation of scientific publications
- f. Informing the public and the press

- (4) Scientific publications that are erroneous due to proven scientific misconduct must be withdrawn if they are still unpublished and corrected if they have already been published (revocation). Cooperation partners must be informed in an appropriate manner, if necessary. In principle, the authors and editors involved are obliged to do so; if they do not take action within a reasonable period of time, Leuphana University Lüneburg will initiate any appropriate measures it deems possible.
- (5) In cases of serious scientific misconduct, Leuphana University Lüneburg informs other affected research institutions or research organisations, and if necessary also professional organisations.

Art. 14 Entry into force

These regulations shall enter into force on the day following their publication in the official journal "GAZETTE". At the same time, the "Guideline of Leuphana University Lüneburg on Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice and on the Procedure for Dealing with Scientific Misconduct" of 8 June 2009 shall expire.