

Additional file 10. Adjusted rankings for most detrimental research misbehaviours on the aggregate level by disciplinary field

Biomedical researchers, bootstrapped, μ, Bca 95% CI		Mean	LB	UB
#1	Insufficient supervision	7.02	6.53	7.49
Natural sciences researchers, bootstrapped, μ, Bca 95% CI		Mean	LB	UB
#1	Insufficient supervision	7.72	6.38	9.19
#2	<i>Not report clearly relevant details of study methods (B, H)</i>	6.95	5.93	7.93
#3	Insufficiently report study flaws and limitations	6.64	5.58	7.74
#4	Let own convictions influence the conclusions substantially	6.38	5.35	7.35
#5	<i>Give insufficient attention to the equipment, skills or expertise which are essential to perform the study (.</i>	6.26	5.23	7.36
#6	Keep inadequate notes of the research process	6	5.03	7.09
#7	Not publish a valid 'negative' study	5.52	4.48	6.63
#8	Fabricate data	5.5	4.69	6.39
#9	Choose a clearly inadequate research design or using evidently unsuitable measurement instruments	5.45	4.55	6.4
#10	<i>Present grossly misleading information in a grant application (B, S)</i>	5.42	4.54	6.5
#11	Selectively delete data, modify data or add fabricated data after performing initial data-analyses	5.39	4.54	6.42
#12	Unfairly review papers, grant applications or colleagues applying for promotion	5.31	4.42	6.38
Social sciences researchers, bootstrapped, μ, Bca 95% CI		Mean	LB	UB
#1	Insufficient supervision	6.95	6.13	7.78
#2	<i>Not publish a valid 'negative' study (H)</i>	6.53	5.71	7.29
#3	Let own convictions influence the conclusions substantially	5.86	5.24	6.48
#4	Choose a clearly inadequate research design or using evidently unsuitable measurement instruments	5.77	5.06	6.51
#5	<i>Give insufficient attention to the equipment, skills or expertise which are essential to perform the study (.</i>	5.71	5.06	6.42
#6	<i>Report an unexpected finding as having been hypothesized from the start (B, N)</i>	5.6	4.94	6.25
Humanities researchers, bootstrapped, μ, Bca 95% CI		Mean	LB	UB
#1	Insufficient supervision	6.76	5.7	7.74
#2	Let own convictions influence the conclusions substantially	6.69	5.46	8
#3	Selectively cite to enhance own findings or convictions	6.17	5.17	7.23
#4	Choose a clearly inadequate research design or using evidently unsuitable measurement instruments	6.11	5.11	7.14
#5	<i>Selectively cite to please editors, reviewers or colleagues (B)</i>	6.03	5.13	7.03
#6	Unfairly review papers, grant applications or colleagues applying for promotion	6.03	4.77	7.41
#7	Make no clear distinction between personal views and professional comments	5.68	4.57	6.82
#8	Insufficiently report study flaws and limitations	5.42	4.64	6.14
#9	Ignore basic principles of quality assurance	5.27	4.48	6.03
#10	Deliberately communicate findings inaccurately in the media or during presentations	5.24	4.11	6.35
#11	Demand or accept an authorship without significant contribution	5.22	4.22	6.25
#12	<i>Use published ideas or phrases of others without referencing (B, N)</i>	5.07	4.07	6.21

Italics indicate misbehaviours that were perceived significantly different on aggregate impact by researchers from this disciplinary field

The group for which the ranking differed is indicated between brackets where: B = biomedicine, N = natural sciences, S = social sciences, H = humanities

LB = lower bound Bca bootstrapped confidence interval, UB = upper bound Bca bootstrapped confidence interval