

Additional file 6. Top 5 most frequent research misbehaviours by academic rank and disciplinary field.

Top 5														
Academic rank, <i>M (SD)</i>							Disciplinary field, <i>M (SD)</i>							
PhD students			Postdocs & assistant professors		Associate & full professors		Biomedicine		Natural sciences		Social sciences		Humanities	
#1	Insufficiently mentor or supervise junior co-workers	2.03 (.77)	Demand or accept an authorship without significant contribution	2.15 (.76)	Selectively cite to please editors, reviewers or colleagues	2.19 (.70)	Add an author who doesn't qualify for authorship	2.14 (.71)	Insufficiently supervise or mentor junior co-workers	2.19 (.78)	Insufficiently supervise or mentor junior co-workers	2.04 (.82)	Selectively cite to please editors, reviewers or colleagues	2.03 (.81)
#2	Demand or accept an authorship without significant contribution	2.03 (.77)	Insufficiently supervise or mentor junior co-workers	2.1 (.75)	Selectively cite to enhance own findings or convictions	2.09 (.70)	Demand or accept an authorship without significant contribution	2.14 (.74)	Selectively cite to please editors, reviewers or colleagues	2.16 (.71)	Demand or accept an authorship without significant contribution	2 (.78)	Let own convictions influence the conclusions substantially	2.03 (.90)
#3	Add an author who doesn't qualify for authorship	1.97 (.73)	Selectively cite to please editors, reviewers or colleagues	2.09 (.77)	Demand or accept an authorship without significant contribution	2.09 (.72)	Insufficiently supervise or mentor junior co-workers	2.06 (.72)	Not report clearly relevant details of study methods	1.98 (.70)	Selectively cite to enhance own findings or convictions	1.96 (.75)	Demand or accept an authorship without significant contribution	2.03 (.74)
#4	Keep inadequate notes of the research process	1.95 (.73)	Selectively cite or cite own work to improve citation metrics	2.04 (.75)	Selectively cite or cite own work to improve citation metrics	2.07 (.77)	Keep inadequate notes of the research process	1.93 (.71)	Keep inadequate notes of the research process	1.95 (.78)	Selectively cite to please editors, reviewers or colleagues	1.95 (.84)	Insufficiently supervise or mentor junior co-workers	2.02 (.77)
#5	Selectively cite to please editors, reviewers or colleagues	1.78 (.75)	Add an author who doesn't qualify for authorship	1.98 (.78)	Insufficiently supervise or mentor junior co-workers	2.04 (.75)	Selectively cite to please editors, reviewers or colleagues	1.88 (.74)	Demand or accept an authorship without significant contribution	1.95 (.84)	Communicate results to the general public before a peer reviewed publication is available	1.88 (.81)	Selectively cite to enhance own findings or convictions	2.00 (.74)

M = mean score per subgroup, SD = standard deviation. The frequency response scale ranged from 1 ('never'), 2 ('once or twice') to 3 ('three times or more'). A mean value of 2.03 ("Insufficiently mentor or supervise junior co-workers") thus means that on average, our respondents stated seeing this research misbehaviour once or twice within the last three years.