



Evaluation results: Rules of Good Scientific Practice (January 29, 2021)

Course details

Instructor: Henrik Hartmann

More information is provided on the webpage: <http://www.imprs-gbgc.de/index.php/Courses/GoodScientificPractice2021>

5 out of 10 participants filled in the survey by February 15, 2021

Survey results

To which extend has the course improved/clarified your general notion of good scientific conduct?

1. As an early career scientist, I learned more about the procedures in publication reviewing and what to avoid in misconducts.
2. Partially: most of the themes were already clear to me.
3. The course has focused on scrutinizing the different gray zones that scientists/researchers might face during their work and has emphasized how to avoid issues and circumstances of ill-scientific practice.
4. I was familiar with the content of the course. Nonetheless, it helped to clear up some of the 'grey' areas on the topic.

Are you aware how the concept of good scientific practice applies to your particular situation (e.g. with respect to your field of studies and your career stage)? How has the seminar contributed to this understanding? Do you have any ideas for further improvement in this respect?


1. Yes! By showing examples of scientific misconducts, how people did wrong in the past, a bad example of a scientific paper misinterpreting or misleading. I learned how to avoid repeating similar mistakes that could happen during research.
2. Yes, most of the concepts of good scientific conduct were known to me, but I appreciate that it is reiterated at such a crucial career stage.
3. I am aware of how the different concepts and mis-applications can be exploited, and the seminar had shed light on other aspects that one should also scrutinize over.
4. I am now more aware of the pressures of early stage scientists and more equipped to deal with them.

Would you recommend this course to others?

1. Yes = 5

Would you recommend this course to others? [Comment]

No comments




Did the trainers take sufficient time / opportunities for questions and discussions?

1. Yes = 5

Did the trainers take sufficient time / opportunities for questions and discussions? [Comment]

1. He did a great job!



Which parts were especially good (and why)?

1. They are all good and clear
2. The exercise/quiz seemed a nice way to involve the audience and let us think about a real-world example. I am glad to realize that there is a shift in perspective in the way papers are supposed to be written and that the role of "emotional" (but still objective) communication is not being negatively stigmatized anymore.
3. The engagement with others when asked to critique a certain paper's methodology and concluded results. In addition to dynamic communication with the presenter.
4. I liked particularly the part of writing a paper, because the lecturer shared with us his experience and gave us very useful tips to make our papers more interesting to a broader audience.
5. All of it was good.

Which parts were not so good / not so fitting / not well enough presented?

1. They are all good and clear
2. I only have slight confusion about what could be considered a conflict of interest within research, other than the more obvious link between science and funding/business.
3. All over well.
4. I think all the parts were good enough.
5. All of it was good

Do you have other suggestions for a future workshop on good scientific practice?

1. All was good!
2. No
3. I would like that the lecture also included a part of tips on how to give good reviews on papers and what to consider when giving feedback when one is asked to.

Do you have any other comments for the trainers & organizer? If so, please feel free to leave us a note.

1. Keep up the great work!