

Guideline on the Principles for Ensuring Good Scientific Practice
at the University of Lübeck
dated 17 June 2025

In view of Section 22 (2) Sentence 1 of the German Higher Education Act (HSG) in the version published on 5 February 2016 (GVOBl. Schl.-H. p. 39), last amended by Article 2 of the Act from 25 March 2025 (GVOBl. 2025 No. 26), the following guideline, by the resolution of the Executive Board from 16 June 2025, is issued:

Section One
Rules of Good Scientific Practice

Title One
General Part

§ 1
Guiding principles

(1) Scientists working at the University of Lübeck are obliged to work according to the rules of good scientific practice. The rules of good scientific practice include the following rules:

1. General principles of scientific work, for example:
 - a) to work *lege artis*,
 - b) to document results and consistently challenge all results themselves,
 - c) to maintain strict honesty with regard to the contributions of partners, competitors, and predecessors,
 - d) to avoid and prevent scientific misconduct,
 - e) to allow and encourage critical discourse in the scientific community,
2. the mentoring of young scientists,
3. cooperation and leadership responsibility in work units,
4. securing and storing primary data,
5. scientific publications as a medium of accountability for scientists about their work,

6. respect for the intellectual property of others,
 7. observance of ethical standards when collecting data.
-
- (2) In addition to measures for identifying and punishing scientific misconduct, appropriate measures must be taken or strengthened to prevent scientific misconduct from occurring. As a centre of research, teaching and the promotion of young scientists, the University of Lübeck has institutional responsibility in this regard.
 - (3) The leaders of work units must conduct themselves in an exemplary academic manner. They - just like students and young scientists in the interest of their own future planning - are to be vigilant with regard to possible misconduct by those around them.
 - (4) The sections are expected to address "scientific misconduct" appropriately in curricular training and to inform students and junior researchers about the principles that apply at the University of Lübeck.
 - (5) The University of Lübeck also meets its responsibility towards its young scientists and technical staff as well as its other members by instructing these persons about the principles of scientific work and good scientific practice, including reference to this guideline; the instruction is given in writing and must be confirmed by signature. This is usually done in the context of starting employment.

§ 2

Professional ethics

- (1) Teaching the basics of good scientific practice begins at the earliest possible stage in scientific training (including teaching) and careers.
- (2) Scientists are committed to the fundamental values of scientific work.
- (3) At all career levels, scientists undergo a continuous process of learning and further training with regard to good scientific practice. They exchange ideas on this and support each other.

§ 3

Organisational responsibility of the Executive Board

- (1) The Executive Board has the competence and the overall responsibility for maintaining and communicating good scientific practice at the University of Lübeck.
- (2) The Executive Board creates the framework conditions for scientific work at the University of Lübeck that complies with the rules by establishing an institutional organisational structure that is

appropriate for this purpose. In this way, the Executive Board creates the conditions for scientists to comply with legal and ethical standards. The framework conditions include clear, defined procedures and principles for staff selection and staff development, especially taking into account gender equality and diversity, as well as for the promotion of young scientists and equal opportunities.

§ 4

Responsibility of the work unit leaders

- (1) The leader of a scientific work unit bears responsibility for the entire unit. The cooperation in scientific work units ensures that the unit can fulfil its tasks as a whole, the necessary cooperation and coordination can take place and all members are aware of their roles, rights and responsibilities.
- (2) The responsibility of the leader of a scientific work unit includes, in particular, the obligation to provide individual support for young scientists embedded in the overall concept of the University of Lübeck and to promote the careers of scientific staff and scientific support staff as well as to communicate the principles of academic probity. For all of them, there must be a primary contact person in the work unit who also communicates the Guidelines for ensuring good scientific practice at the University of Lübeck.
- (3) Abuse of power and exploitation of dependencies is counteracted by appropriate organisational measures both at the level of the individual academic departments or work units and at the level of the Executive Board.
- (4) Scientists enjoy a balance of support and personal responsibility appropriate to their career level.

§ 5

Achievement dimensions and evaluation criteria

- (1) The evaluation of scientists' achievement follows a multidimensional approach.
- (2) Originality and quality always take precedence over quantity as performance and evaluation criteria for examinations, awarding degrees, promotions, recruitment, appointments and resource allocations. In principle, applications should specify a maximum number for the publications to be submitted as proof of academic achievement. If provided voluntarily, individual characteristics in CVs are also included in the assessment.
- (3) Other achievement dimensions can be included in promotions, hiring, appointments and resource allocations, for example involvement in teaching, academic self-administration, public relations, knowledge and technology transfer, contributions in the interest of society as a whole, openness to knowledge, and willingness to take risks. Personal, family or health-related periods of absence or consequently extended periods of training or qualification, alternative career paths or comparable

circumstances must be taken into account appropriately.

§ 6

Cross-phase quality assurance, methods and standards

- (1) Scientists carry out every step of the research process de lege artis. Continuous and cross-phase quality assurance takes place.
- (2) The origin of data, organisms, materials, and software used in the research process is identified, with citation of the original sources, and information is provided on the requirements for subsequent use. If publicly available software is used, it must be documented in a persistent and citable manner, citing the source code, as far as this is possible and reasonable.
- (3) The type and scope of research data generated in the research process are described.
- (4) It is an essential part of quality assurance that other scientists are enabled to replicate results or findings.
- (5) If scientific findings are made publicly available (also via channels other than publications), the applied quality assurance mechanisms are outlined. If, in retrospect, discrepancies or errors concerning such findings are noticed or pointed out, they will be corrected.
- (6) Scientifically sound and comprehensible methods are used in the research. When developing and applying new methods, scientists place particular emphasis on quality assurance and the establishment of standards.

§ 7

Stakeholders, responsibilities and roles

The roles and responsibilities of the scientists involved in a research project as well as of the scientific support staff must be clear at all times during the research project. Those involved define their roles and responsibilities themselves by agreement in text form at the latest at the beginning of the research project and adapt them as necessary.

§ 8

Research draft

- (1) When planning a project, the current state of research must be fully considered and acknowledged. Identifying relevant and appropriate research questions requires careful research into research outputs that have already been made publicly available. The University of Lübeck ensures the necessary framework conditions for this, taking into account its actual and financial possibilities.

- (2) Methods to avoid (unconscious) bias in the interpretation of findings must be applied to the furthest possible extent. Scientists check whether and, if so, to what extent, gender and diversity can be significant for the research project (with regard to the methods, the work programme, the objectives, etc.).

§ 9

Legal and ethical framework, rights of use

- (1) Scientists comply with legal requirements, the legal and ethical framework of the University of Lübeck as well as rights and obligations arising from contracts with third parties and exercise their freedom of research responsibly. Ensuring good scientific practice requires continuous, careful and complete documentation of the research project by the lead researcher.
- (2) Before starting and during their research project, scientists must check whether the ethics committee should be involved. If the ethics committee must be involved, the scientists are obliged to obtain a verdict from the ethics committee.
- (3) With regard to research projects, there must be a thorough assessment of the research consequences (e.g. dual use) and the evaluation of the respective ethical aspects.
- (4) As far as possible and reasonable, scientists should conclude written and individual agreements on rights of use for data and results arising from the research project at the earliest possible stage in the research project.
- (5) Data and results may be used in particular by the scientists who collected the data. Those entitled to use the data set out rules on whether and how third parties are to be granted access to the research data.

§ 10

Documentation

- (1) Scientists document all information relevant to the achievement of a research result in a laboratory journal. The documentation must be as comprehensible as is necessary and appropriate in the field concerned in order to be able to review and evaluate the result and to enable replication. When research software is developed, its source code is documented as far as this is possible and reasonable. Individual results that do not support the research hypothesis must always be documented. There must be no selection of results in this context.
- (2) If concrete professional recommendations exist for the review and evaluation, the scientists prepare the documentation according to the respective specifications.

- (3) If the documentation does not meet the requirements under paragraphs (1) and (2), the limitations and reasons must be explained in a comprehensible manner. Documentations and research results must not be manipulated. They must be adequately protected against manipulation.

§ 11

Archiving

- (1) Research data or research results that have been made publicly accessible, as well as the central materials on which they are based and, if applicable, the research software used, must be adequately safeguarded in accordance with the standards of the discipline concerned on durable and secure media in the institution in which they were created or in multi-site repositories and stored for a period of ten years. In justified cases, shortened retention periods may be appropriate; the corresponding reasons must be transparently described. If there are comprehensible reasons for not retaining certain data, the scientists must explain this. The retention period begins with the date on which public access was established. In all other respects, the retention policy of the University of Lübeck shall apply.
- (2) The University of Lübeck ensures that the necessary infrastructure enabling archiving is in place.

§ 12

Scientific publications

- (1) Authors of scientific publications always bear joint responsibility for their content. "Honorary authorship" is inadmissible.
- (2) Subject to different practices as recognised in different disciplines, the following guidelines should be followed for the format of scientific publications:
 1. The designation as "original work" can only be given to the first reporting of new observations or experimental results, including conclusions. Consequently, multiple publication of the same results, apart from preliminary bulletins in current cases, is only permissible if the previously published results are clearly indicated and only to the extent that this is necessary for an understanding of the context. Repeated publication of the same results without explicit reference to the repetition is therefore not permissible.
 2. Scientific investigations and research results must be complete and verifiable. Provision of public access is governed by § 13.
 3. Findings that support or question the author's hypothesis must be communicated with equal emphasis.

4. Findings and ideas of other researchers as well as relevant publications by other authors must be cited appropriately.
 5. There must be no fragmentation of studies with the aim of increasing the number of seemingly independent publications.
 6. The publication medium must be carefully selected, taking into account its quality and visibility in the respective field of discourse. A key selection criterion is whether the publication body has established its own guidelines for good scientific practice. In addition to publications in books and journals, specialist repositories, data and software repositories and blogs are particularly worthy of consideration. A new or unknown publication organ must be checked for its trustworthiness. The scientific quality of a contribution does not depend on the publication medium in which it is made publicly available.
- (3) If several persons are involved in a research project or in writing a scientific report, those who have made a genuine, traceable contribution to the content of a scientific text, data or software publication should be named as co-authors. A genuine, comprehensible contribution exists in particular if a scientist contributes in a scientifically relevant manner to
1. the development and conception of the research project or
 2. the preparation, collection, procurement, provision of the data, software, sources or
 3. the analysis/evaluation or interpretation of the data, sources and the conclusions drawn therefrom; or
 4. writing the manuscript.

The persons involved agree in good time - usually at the latest when the manuscript is formulated on who is to be a co-author. The understanding must be based on comprehensible criteria and take into account the conventions of each discipline. Co-authorship is not to be established merely by virtue of the provision of funding, equipment or general management of the department or institution in which the research was conducted. The same applies to merely reading the manuscript without helping to shape its content. Furthermore,

5. in the case of reports from several work units, the contributions of the individual units should be identified as far as possible,
6. all co-authors must confirm the release of a manuscript for publication with their signature and the contributions of the individual persons or work units must be documented,

7. subject to other recognised subject-specific convention, written informed consent must be obtained if unpublished observations of other persons are cited in the manuscript or findings from other institutions are used.

If a contribution is not sufficient to justify authorship, this support can be appropriately acknowledged in footnotes, in the preface or in the acknowledgements.

- (4) All authors must agree to the final version of the work to be published. By agreeing to be named as a co-author, the author fundamentally accepts co-responsibility for ensuring that the co-authored publication complies with the scientific standard. This means that each author is responsible for the correctness of their own contribution as well as for the correctness of the entire manuscript, unless the journal or the publisher provides for a regulation regarding responsibility only for certain sections, which is evident from the publication or the submitted documents. Consent to a publication may not be refused without sufficient reason. Rather, the refusal must be justified with verifiable criticism of data, methods or results.
- (5) If scientists are named as (co-)authors in a publication without their consent, and if they feel unable to give subsequent approval, they are expected to explicitly express their objection to their inclusion in the group of authors to the lead or senior authors (as the main people responsible as a rule) and to the journal in question.

§ 13

Establishing public access to research results

- (1) Scientists generally contribute all their results to the scientific discourse.
- (2) In individual cases, there may be reasons not to make results publicly available. As a matter of principle, the decision to make results publicly available must not depend on third parties; rather, scientists generally decide on their own responsibility whether, how and where to make their results publicly available, taking into account the practices of the respective discipline. Exceptions are permitted in particular where the rights of third parties are affected, there are prospective patent applications, or the research is contract research or security-relevant research.
- (3) If results are made publicly available, they are described fully and comprehensibly. This also includes making the research data, materials and information on which the results are based, the methods applied and the software used available, as far as this is possible and reasonable. This is done according to the so-called FAIR principle: Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Re-Usable. Exceptions are permitted in the context of patent applications.
- (4) In this context, self-programmed software is made accessible by stating its source code, as far as this is possible and reasonable. If appropriate, licensing is provided. Work processes are presented in detail.

- (5) Own and external preparatory work must be demonstrated in full and correctly, unless this can be waived in exceptional cases for specific disciplines in the case of own results that are already publicly available. At the same time, the repetition of the contents of own publications is limited to what is required for comprehension.

§ 14

Confidentiality and neutrality in assessments and consultations

- (1) Scientists who evaluate submitted manuscripts or funding applications in particular are obliged to maintain strict confidentiality. They must disclose the facts that may give rise to conflicts of interest and concerns of bias and notify the respective competent body without delay. These obligations also apply to members of scientific advisory and decision-making bodies.
- (2) Confidentiality includes that content to which access is gained within the framework of the function is not passed on to third parties and may not be used for the user's own purposes.

Title Two

Special Part

§ 15

Scientific misconduct

- (1) Scientific misconduct is deemed to have occurred if, in a context relevant to scientific research, false statements are made deliberately or through gross negligence, the intellectual property of others is infringed or their research activities are otherwise impaired, in particular through

1. false information such as

- a) the invention of data,
- b) the falsification of data and sources, such as
 - by suppressing relevant sources, evidence or texts,
 - by selecting and rejecting undesirable results without disclosing them, or
 - by manipulating a representation or illustration,
- c) incorrect information in a letter of application or a grant application (including false information on the publication organ and on publications in print),
- d) 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 to substantial scientific knowledge, hypotheses, doctrines or research originating from others, such as

- a) the unauthorised exploitation under presumption of authorship (plagiarism),
- b) the exploitation of research approaches and ideas, especially as a reviewer (theft of ideas),
- c) the unauthorised disclosure of data, theories and findings to third parties,
- d) the presumption or unfounded assumption of scientific authorship or co-authorship,
- e) the falsification of the content,
- f) the unauthorised publication and unauthorised making available to third parties whilst the work, finding, hypothesis, teaching or research approach have not yet been published,
- g) the claim of the (co-)authorship of others without their consent, or
- h) the unauthorised use of content and data exchanged confidentially within work units.

3. Impairment of research activities through

- a) the sabotage of research activities such as
 - damaging, destroying or tampering with experimental set-ups, equipment, records, hardware, software, chemicals or other items needed by another individual to conduct an experiment,
 - malicious concealment or theft of books, archival records, handwritten documents, data sets,
 - intentionally rendering scientifically relevant information carriers, such as books, documents or other data, unusable,
- b) the falsification or unauthorised removal of research data or research documents,
- c) the falsification or unauthorised removal of the documentation of research data,
- d) making data and content inaccessible, especially in the case of defined research associations and agreed collaborations.

(2) Scientific misconduct also consists in conduct from which joint responsibility for the misconduct of others arises, in particular through

- 1. active participation,
- 2. co-authorship of publications containing fabrications, or
- 3. gross neglect of the duty of supervision.

Section Two
Procedure in cases of suspected scientific misconduct

First Title

Jurisdiction

§ 16

Prosecution of scientific misconduct

- (1) The University of Lübeck will investigate any concrete suspicion of scientific misconduct at the university; it may also investigate substantiated anonymous reports. For this purpose, the Senate establishes a permanent investigative commission to investigate the facts of the case ex officio. The investigative commission takes appropriate action to protect both the whistleblower and the person affected by the allegations and conducts the investigation with due regard for confidentiality and the fundamental principle of the presumption of innocence. If it detects scientific misconduct, the Executive Board will take the measures appropriate to the individual case within the scope of the available options.
- (2) The persons affected by the allegations must not suffer any disadvantages for their own academic or professional advancement as a result of the report.
- (3) The proceedings before the investigative commission do not replace other proceedings regulated by law or statute (e.g. academic proceedings, proceedings under labour or service law or civil service law, civil or criminal proceedings). If necessary, these are initiated by the respective responsible bodies.
- (4) The Executive Board must examine whether and to what extent other researchers (former and potential cooperation partners, co-authors), scientific institutions, scientific journals and publishers (in the case of publications), funding bodies and scientific organisations, professional associations, ministries and the public should or must be notified.

§ 17

Whistleblowers

- (1) Scientists who report specifiable suspected scientific misconduct (whistleblowers) must not suffer any disadvantages for their own scientific and professional advancement as a result. The ombudsperson, as well as the investigative commission and the Executive Board, take appropriate action to ensure this protection. This also applies in the case of unproven scientific misconduct, provided the report was not made with verifiable better knowledge.

- (2) The report must be made in good faith. Deliberately false allegations can themselves constitute scientific misconduct.

§ 18

Ombudspersons

- (1) The Executive Board appoints two tenured or permanent staff members or retired professors of the University of Lübeck as ombudspersons to whom the scientists of the University of Lübeck can turn in cases of conflict as well as in questions of suspected scientific misconduct. One ombudsperson should belong to the Medicine Section and one to the Computer Science/Technology/Natural Sciences Sections. The appointment is for three years with the possibility of reappointment once. The ombudspersons represent each other. They are to be announced on the website of the University of Lübeck.
- (2) The ombudspersons receive possible allegations of scientific misconduct in confidence and pass them on to the investigative commission if appropriate. Among other things, they advise the members of the university and research institutions on matters of good scientific practice. They are not obliged to report to the Executive Board.
- (3) Ombudspersons may not be a member of a central governing body of their institution while performing their role.
- (4) The ombudspersons carry out their ombudsperson activities independently, in particular independently of instructions or informal individual case-related influence by university bodies. The activity is performed under observance of confidentiality.
- (5) Scientists may choose to turn to the ombudspersons of the University of Lübeck or to the supra-regional body "Ombudsman for Science".
- (6) Ombudspersons receive the necessary substantive support and acceptance from the Executive Board in the performance of their duties. In order to increase the functionality of the ombudsperson's office, the University of Lübeck takes measures to relieve incumbent ombudspersons in other ways, such as allowing them to use the office of the investigative commission for good scientific practice.

§ 19

Investigative commission

- (1) The investigative commission is responsible for investigating suspected scientific misconduct pursuant to §§ 20 to 22.

(2) The investigative commission consists of five members, of whom

1. four are professors and
2. one is a member of the scientific service.

Members according to 1. may be retired professors of the University of Lübeck. There is one deputy for each member.

- (3) The members of the investigative commission and their deputies are elected by the Senate. The term of office is three years with the possibility of re-election. Should the term of office of the members and affiliates of the investigative commission end during proceedings, it is automatically extended until the end of the proceedings. The investigative commission elects one of its members as chairperson.
- (4) The ombudspersons according to § 18 are part of the investigative commission as guests with an advisory vote.
- (5) The investigative commission further includes a person qualified to hold judicial office in an advisory capacity. This person does not have to be a member of the University of Lübeck. They are proposed by the Senate and appointed by the Executive Board for a term of three years with the possibility of reappointment.
- (6) The members of the investigative commission are subject to official secrecy. If they are not in the public service of the University of Lübeck, they must be specially committed to secrecy by the chairperson; the same applies to persons called in as experts. The commitment must be recorded on file.
- (7) The names of the members and affiliates must be published on the website of the University of Lübeck.

Second Title

Proceedings

§ 20

General Rules of Procedure of the investigative commission proceedings

- (1) The meetings of the investigative commission are not open to the public. Until culpable misconduct has been proven, the information on the parties to the proceedings and the findings to date must be kept strictly confidential.

- (2) The investigative commission is quorate if all members have been duly summoned and the majority of the voting members are present. Decisions of the investigative commission are taken by a simple majority of the votes cast. Abstentions and invalid votes are counted as votes not cast. In the event of a tie, a resolution is rejected.
- (3) In order to avoid delays, a change of members and affiliates in an ongoing investigation procedure is only possible in particularly justified exceptional cases. If a member or an affiliate resigns, a by-election or a by-appointment must be held for the remainder of the term of office of the original incumbent in accordance with the provisions of §§ 18 and 19.
- (4) If the person concerned, a member or an affiliate of the investigative commission considers themselves to be biased, this circumstance must be reported to the chairperson without delay. The chairperson removes the biased member or affiliate from these proceedings and asks the Senate to elect a member for the further proceedings.
- (5) The investigative commission is entitled to take all steps that are conducive to clarifying the facts of the case. To this end, it may obtain all necessary information and statements from all members of the university and other parties involved, with due reference to the obligation to maintain confidentiality, and in individual cases also consult the Equal Opportunities Officer and experts from the academic field concerned. Furthermore, it may call in other persons with special expertise in the field of the scientific matter to be assessed or who have experience in dealing with relevant procedures in an advisory capacity.
- (6) The person concerned must be informed of the incriminating facts and, if applicable, the evidence.
- (7) The identity of the informant must be kept confidential. It may not be disclosed to third parties without appropriate consent. This does not apply if there is a legal disclosure requirement or if this information appears necessary for the proper defence of the person affected by the allegations, e.g. because the credibility and motives of the informant are of material importance in determining the misconduct.
- (8) The investigative commission makes its decisions freely, taking into account the facts of the case and the evidence gathered.
- (9) The deadlines regulated in this Guideline are procedural acceleration deadlines. The other time limits to be set for statements, hearings, proceedings and decisions are to be set by the investigative commission in such a way as to ensure an expeditious procedure.
- (10) In special individual cases where, for instance, several institutions are affected, the investigative commission may conduct the investigation procedure jointly with other affected universities, non-university research institutions and other scientific organisations. Here, in particular the entire object of investigation may be investigated jointly or the individual allegations may be divided among the individual institutions concerned for further investigation. The President and the person concerned as well as the informants must be informed of this. The investigating institutions must

agree on the content of the further proceedings.

§ 21

Preliminary investigation procedure

- (1) In the case of concrete suspicious facts indicating scientific misconduct, the ombudsperson or the chairperson of the UKgwP must be immediately informed. The information should be in writing (in electronic form, if necessary); in the case of information provided orally, a written record of the suspicion and the supporting documents is to be made.
- (2) As soon as the chairperson of the UKgwP learns of specific suspicious facts indicating scientific misconduct, he or she – even if the ombudsperson has not been previously informed – begins the preliminary investigation proceedings, in which he or she gives the person concerned an opportunity to comment on the suspicions in writing within a two-week period. The incriminating and exonerating facts and evidence must be documented in writing.
- (3) The members of the UKgwP are to be informed of the allegations at the same time.
- (4) Upon receipt of the statement of the person concerned or after the time limit has expired, the UKgwP shall decide with a period of two weeks whether to terminate the preliminary investigation proceedings because the suspicion has not been sufficiently confirmed or if it is to be transferred to the formal investigation proceedings. The rationale for the termination of proceedings is to be communicated to the person concerned and to the informant.

§ 22

Formal investigation

- (1) The opening of the formal investigation proceedings shall be communicated to the executive committee by the chairperson of the UKgwP.
- (2) The UKgwP officially determines the facts. For this purpose, it can request comments from all members of the university and other interested parties and invite them to an oral discussion. Both the person concerned and the informant are given the opportunity to give an oral statement. The UKgwP shall set time limits for the statements/responses and information to be collected.
- (3) If the UKgwP considers a misconduct as not proven, the proceedings are terminated. If the UKgwP considers that misconduct has been proven, it shall present the result of its investigation to the executive committee with a proposal for further proceedings, also with regard to the protection of the rights of others, for its decision and further action.
- (4) The significant rationale that has led to the termination of the proceedings or to it being forwarded to the executive committee is to be communicated to the person concerned and the informant in writing and without delay.

- (5) At the end of a formal investigation, the ombudsperson shall identify all those involved in the case. He or she shall advise those individuals, in particular the young scientists and the students who were, through no fault of their own, involved in the scientific misconduct process, with regard to safeguarding their personal and scientific integrity.

Section III

Consequences of Scientific Misconduct

§ 23

Possible decisions

- (1) If scientific misconduct is formally established by the UKgwP, decisions of different natures and scope come under consideration by the respective appropriate institution. Since each case may be different and the severity of the identified scientific misconduct plays a role in the decision, there cannot be a single set of procedures for the appropriate consequences; rather, these depend on the circumstances of the individual case. While not exhaustive, the following measures may be considered, depending on the circumstances of the case:
1. Labour or public sector employment law consequences, in particular
 - written warning,
 - extraordinary dismissal,
 - ordinary termination,
 - termination of contract;
 2. Civil service law consequences, in particular
 - disciplinary measures;
 3. Academic consequences, in particular
 - revocation of academic degrees, in particular the Magister or doctoral degree, if it was based on falsified publications or otherwise fraudulently obtained,
 - revocation of the teaching authorization,
 - information from independent/non-university scientific institutions and associations,
 - demand for the retraction of scientific publications;
 4. Consequences under civil law, in particular
 - issuance of a house ban (permission to enter the premises has been revoked),
 - claims for restitution against those concerned, such as claims with regard to stolen scientific material,
 - claims of removal and injunctive relief relating to copyright, violations of personality rights,
 - patent law and competition law,
 - claims for repayment (such as scholarships, third-party funds or the like),
 - claims for damages of the University of Lübeck or third parties in the case of personal injury,

- property damage or the like;
1. Consequences under criminal law, particularly those such as criminal charges or the demand for a penalty, whereby those come into consideration, if the suspicion exists that the scientific misconduct at the same time fulfils an offense of the penal code (StGB) or other criminal norms or misdemeanours, as in particular with
 - copyright infringement,
 - falsification of documents (including falsification of technical records),
 - property damage (including alteration of data),
 - property crime (offence) and offenses against property (such as in the case of thefts, fraudulent acquisition of funds or misappropriation of funds,
 - violations of personal life or secret matters (such as by spying on data or exploiting the secrets of others),
 - bodily harm (such as study participants due to false data);
 6. Concerning information about vulnerable third parties and/or the public; in order to protect third parties, to maintain their trust in scientific honesty and integrity, to restore their scientific reputation, to prevent consequential damage or otherwise in the general public interest, affected third parties and/or the press should be adequately informed as to the outcome of the investigation.
- (2) There is the possibility of voluntary participation in a course for good scientific practice. Such participation may have an impact on the imposition of sanctions in favour of the person concerned.

§ 24

Entry into force / Final provisions

- (1) These standard procedures enter into force on the day following their adoption.
- (2) At the same time, the standard procedures „Grundsätze zur Sicherung guter wissenschaftlicher Praxis an der Universität zu Lübeck“ [the official German-language version of “Principles for Ensuring Good Academic Practice at the University of Lübeck”] of 28 March 2023 cease to be in force.
- (3) Members and affiliates of the UKgwP are to be elected, re-elected or re-appointed in accordance with §§ 18, 19 and 20 paragraph 3 sentence 1.