

INVESTIGATION REPORT CHECKLIST¹
Office of Research Integrity
Division of Investigative Oversight

DIO/ORI # _____

1. Summary of inquiry report and background information
2. Name, position, and contact information of respondent(s) and complainant(s) and contact information for respondent's attorney, if applicable
3. Allegations received and examined by the institution, including the complainant's comments and the date the institution received the allegations
 - a. Description of the allegation(s) of research misconduct – each allegation should be framed with:
 - 1) Respondent's name, if known
 - 2) Where the falsified/fabricated/plagiarized (f/f/p) data/information were included (paper, grant application, etc.)
 - 3) Which specific figure, text, or data were falsified/fabricated/plagiarized
 - 4) What the alleged f/f/p was and what the actual experimental results were, if known
 - b. Any additional research misconduct allegation(s) that arose during the investigation, including:
 - 1) Other papers or manuscripts submitted but not accepted for publication
 - 2) Other PHS grant applications submitted for funding or awarded
 - 3) Progress reports, presentations, posters, or other research records
 - c. Any additional respondents identified during the investigation
4. PHS support/ORI jurisdiction
 - a. Grant, grant application, or contract number(s), designated Principal Investigator(s) (PI[s]), and date(s) of application submission or award (with project dates)
 - b. List of paper(s), abstract(s), poster(s), or presentation(s) affected, and the PHS support for each
 - c. List of any grants or contracts that were withdrawn or publications that were corrected or retracted

¹The contents of this document do not have the force and effect of law and are not meant to bind the public in any way. This document is intended only to provide clarity to the public regarding existing requirements under the law or agency policies.

- d. If the alleged research misconduct occurred more than six years before the date the institution received the initial allegation of research misconduct, identification of respondent's subsequent use, if any, that meets the requirements of 42 C.F.R. § 93.105(b)(1).
5. Composition of the investigation committee (names, degrees, departmental affiliation, and expertise) and the charge to the committee
6. Notice to the respondent of the investigation and of any new allegations that arose during the investigation
 - a. Respondent's response(s) to the notice(s)
 - b. If relevant, admission statement from the respondent
7. Attachments/Exhibits of evidence and other relevant documents sequestered during the investigation
 - a. Annotated inventory of sequestered records/evidence and chain of custody document(s)
 - b. Description of how sequestration was conducted
 - c. Identification of any sequestered records/evidence that were not reviewed by the investigation committee, if applicable
8. Transcripts or recordings of interviews of the respondent(s), complainant(s), and witness(es) with their names, degrees, and departmental affiliation
9. Institutional policies and procedures²
10. Timeline, process, and procedural history
11. Investigation committee's analysis
 - a. Assessment of all relevant information
 - b. Findings and conclusions for each allegation

²In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 93.301, the responsible institutional official must assure on behalf of the institution that the institution: has written policies and procedures in compliance with this part for inquiring into and investigating allegations of research misconduct; and complies with its own policies and procedures and the requirements of this regulation. Institutions maintain their assurance by submitting an Annual Report on Possible Research Misconduct (Form PHS-6349): https://ori.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/2020-01/PHS-6349_2019.pdf to: ORI_Assurance@hhs.gov

- c. For each finding of research misconduct (§ 93.313(f)):
 - 1) Identify whether the research misconduct was falsification, fabrication, or plagiarism, and if it was intentional, knowing, or in reckless disregard;
 - 2) Summarize the facts and the analysis which support the conclusion and consider the merits of any reasonable explanation by the respondent;
 - 3) Identify the specific PHS support;
 - 4) Identify whether any publications need correction or retraction;
 - 5) Identify the person(s) responsible for the misconduct; and
 - 6) List any current support or known applications or proposals for support that the respondent has pending with non-PHS federal agencies
- d. Conclusion or recommended findings and institutional actions
- 12. Description of any factors that may have affected the investigation
- 13. Respondent's (and if applicable, the complainant's) response to draft investigation report
 - a. Investigation committee's response to the comments
- 14. Written decision from the responsible institutional official with institutional findings (or no findings) of research misconduct and administrative actions pending or completed
- 15. Notice to the respondent (and if applicable, the complainant) of the institutional decision